

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XX. No. 21 }
WHOLE No. 515 }

MARCH 1, 1919

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR

Chronicle

The War.—Delayed reports coming from Archangel on February 21, state that Canadian, Italian, Serbian and Russian troops in an offensive movement to the *Military Movements*, south along the Murmansk Railroad,

Feb. 17, p.m.-Feb. 24, a.m. as far back as February 19, advanced thirty-five miles, captured considerable railway material together with some prisoners, and inflicted heavy losses upon the Bolsheviks. While some of the troops marched through the woods on skis, thus outflanking the enemy at the bridge near the village of Cegishi, the Serbians carried on a frontal attack along the railroad and after considerable fighting drove the enemy past the bridge. The Allies occupied the village of Cegishi, eighty miles south of Sorotzka. All along the immediate Archangel front the various sectors remained quiet. Peasants coming into the Allied lines reported that several Bolshevik commands had mutinied and refused to stay at the front.

The new armistice terms, which are to reduce still further Germany's military power and seriously disable her on land, in the air and on the sea, and are to be a practical duplicate of the terms to be imposed upon her by the peace treaty, were finally drawn up, and were the subject of a long conference on February 22, between General Tasker H. Bliss, Colonel E. M. House and other members of the American commission. In an effort to allay French fears the Allies determined on a more drastic plan of reduction of the German forces than was at first outlined. According to the plan now contemplated, the realization of which seems almost certain, Germany will be permitted to have no more than ten divisions in her new army, which would amount to about 150,000 men. In addition to this agreement, which appears to reduce to a great extent the danger which France feels threatens her on her eastern frontier, it seems to be admitted that both Great Britain and America, through their representatives in Paris, virtually pledged themselves to maintain at home adequate military establishments so as to give France effective assistance, should it prove necessary. But it was not made plain in Paris what kind of effective aid could be given by the United States, for instance, in view of the constitu-

tional authority exercised by Congress over the army and navy appropriations. Naval and aerial disarmament is also provided for in the new armistice, together with the razing of the frontier fortifications and those of Heligoland and of the Kiel Canal. Supporters of the plan of the League of Nations, the completed draft of which President Wilson carried back with him to the United States when he left Brest for Boston, February 15, are fearful of the consequences in France of the unwillingness of the House Committee, as reported in dispatches received in Paris from Washington, to sanction any permanent army in the United States of more than 175,000 men. French statesmen point out that such an army, 3,000 miles away, would afford little protection to France, and France, following the principles laid down by M. Stephen Pichon, still advances this as an argument why the League of Nations should be backed by some international force. The French feeling also seems to be that the protection of France demands that its frontier shall be the Rhine or that a buffer State shall be created on the left bank of that river.

The League of Nations was during the week submitted to severe criticism in the Senate of the United States by Senator Poindexter, Republican, of Washington, by Senator Borah, Republican, of Idaho, and Senator Reed, Democrat, of Missouri. In his criticism of the League in the Senate on February 22, Mr. Reed took the ground that it ran contrary to the Constitution in putting in the hands of foreign delegates, power to control the policies of this Government. He called it an abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, a plunge into internationalism that might run to Bolshevism and an utter abandonment of the principles for which George Washington and all other leading Americans had stood. The Missouri Senator denounced the League plan as "infamous."

With regard to the League and its plans the American press is divided. The *New York Times* believes that in the framing of the League "the most momentous forward step in the history of civilization has taken place." The *Buffalo Courier* says that "while the constitution of the society of nations may be criticized by

the extremists who want the creation of an international State, and may be attacked by those conservatives who object to the use of outside national forces in international affairs, on the whole it is a very able document, and marks a great step forward in the world's international relations." The *St. Louis Globe Democrat* does not believe that the League erects any super-state, or that it demands any surrender of material sovereignty. The *State* (Columbia, S. C.) sees in the constitution of the League "the greatest, the most nobly conceived document and charter of rights in all history." The *Lynn Item* believes that "it is the Magna Charta of the democratic nations of the world." The *Atlanta Constitution* declares that those who set themselves against the League of Nations idea proclaim themselves as being behind the modern thought of the world, and that their objections about entangling alliances and our country becoming involved in European affairs belong to another age than this. "They are groping in the darkness of a long-past day and trying to make capital out of a doctrine that was enunciated before railroad-trains, steamboats, the telephone, the telegraph, to say nothing of the submarine, the airplane, or wireless telegraphy were ever dreamed of."

Canada.—The death of Sir Wilfred Laurier, the veteran statesman of Quebec, which took place at Ottawa on February 17, puts an end to the career of one who

*Sir Wilfred
Laurier*

has been justly called one of the most picturesque figures of Canadian politics. He was, when he succumbed to a stroke of paralysis, seventy-eight years of age, of which he had spent almost fifty in active political life, being throughout that period an official character of great prominence. His death is mourned by all Canada, and in token of the universal esteem in which he has been held by admirers and adversaries alike, the Federal Government voted him national obsequies. He was one of the great outstanding figures of the past century, and was even classed by some among the five greatest men of his time; with MacDonald and Cartier he was unquestionably one of the makers of modern Canada. In the course of his unprecedentedly long parliamentary career he had to deal with extremely difficult questions, and, as was inevitable, had his critics even among his friends, but he never failed to command respect; he achieved a measure of success given to few men, and whether in success or failure he challenged the admiration of friend and foe alike. Even when he had been replaced at the head of the Government, it was to him, as another Roosevelt, that all turned, for he could always be counted on for sane views, conscientiously and fearlessly expressed, so that no discussion was complete until he had voiced his opinion.

In private life he was scarcely less remarkable than in his public functions. A Catholic of simple faith, a friend of the poor no less than of the rich, he possessed

a gentleness, a sympathy, a kindness of character, that made him always ready to give aid to those in need with that self-effacing, unobtrusive charity which he had learned from the Gospel. Joined with all this there was a quiet dignity, a cultivation of mind, a clearness of judgment, a strength of resolution, and a charm of personality, which made him not only a leader in his own party, but a man respected and beloved by all parties. His personal influence was incalculable.

Central Powers.—Kurt Eisner, the Bavarian Premier, was killed while on his way from the Foreign Ministry to the Diet. The perpetrator of the deed was

*Bavarian Premier
Slain; New Revolution*

Lieutenant Count Arco Valley, who is said to have been lynched by a mob.

Kurt Eisner was a Socialist of the more radical type. He in no way represented the people, but had seized the reins of government amid the confusion of the revolutionary uprising when the royal family was deposed. His party did not poll more than three per cent of the votes in the recent elections for the Bavarian Diet. It is said that he was heading a Spartacan movement against the more moderate and conservative factions in Bavaria. He was a Jew, born in Galicia, who attained prominence as a Socialist journalist. In the elections for the German National Assembly he was defeated by an overwhelming vote. With his death a new Spartacan revolution broke loose which, by the aid of other Socialist groups, succeeded in obtaining complete control of the country. As Herr Auer, Bavarian Minister of the Interior, announced the death of Eisner in the Landtag, shots were fired by a soldier, wounding the Minister. This was the beginning of a fusillade. Several Ministers and deputies were either wounded or killed. As a consequence a proletariate dictatorship was set up and it was proclaimed that the new Government should be modeled upon the Bolshevist type. The red flames of terrorism are spreading through Bavaria. Archbishop Faulhaber, of the diocese of Würzburg, is said to have been arrested by Munich rioters. A despatch from Berlin states that the first President of the Bavarian Soviet Republic is Herr Simon, chairman of the Workmen's and Peasants' Council. Conditions are chaotic, the telegraph lines have been seized and all news is regarded with suspicion. Many deputies are said to have been arrested, but it is also reported that the Bavarian regiments outside of Munich are prepared to come to the city's support if the Spartacides attempted to terrorize it. The arming of workingmen is thought to have been in progress since Saturday.

In the elections recently held in German Austria no party secured an absolute majority. According to advices received immediately after the voting the Socialists were credited with one hundred members, the Christian Social party, corresponding to the German Center, with eighty, and the Liberals with seventy. The result will probably be the formation of a Coalition Government.

Mexico.—A Mexican Archbishop, in exile in Chicago, recently received the following very interesting, if somewhat belated, letter from Cardinal Amette:

French Sympathy

On his return from America, Mgr. Baudrillart laid before the Archbishops and Bishops, the protectors of the Catholic University of Paris, gathered together for their usual annual meeting, the sad and truly intolerable condition of the Church in Mexico.

We have been deeply moved by the recital. From our hearts we sympathize with you in your sufferings, and in union with our venerable brethren in the United States, we protest with all our strength against the dangerous attacks made in your country against the Faith and against Christian liberty.

Earnestly do we desire that our protest be heard effectively in order that justice be done, and that in Mexico, as in all civilized nations respect be assured to those great principles of popular freedom and liberty of conscience whose reign in the world the coming Peace Congress intends to secure.

Deprived as we are of any other means of helping your cause, we earnestly beg of God to take it in His protecting hands. To you and to all your venerable brethren, the Bishops of Mexico, we offer the homage of our respectful and fraternal sympathy. His Eminence, Cardinal Luçon, Archbishop of Reims, and the twenty-seven other Archbishops and Bishops, who are the protectors of the Catholic Institute, have commissioned me to convey to you these sentiments.

A short time after this communication reached Chicago, Mgr. Baudrillart, rector of the Catholic University of Paris, wrote as follows to the aforesaid Mexican prelate:

Your Grace has already received a letter that his Eminence, Cardinal Amette, wrote in the name of all the Bishops, the protectors of the Catholic University of Paris. I have since had an interview with *La Croix*, which I have the honor of transmitting to you. I have presented the request of the Mexican Bishops to M. Poincaré, President of the Republic, in the audience that he honored me with on the 17th of December last, and he said I should speak of this with M. Pichon, Minister of Foreign Affairs; his Eminence, Cardinal Amette, will send him a note to this effect. I hope, Monsignor, you and your venerable brothers in the Hierarchy will recognize that we have done all we could to further your wishes. May your Grace deign to present to Monsignori, the Archbishops of Yucatan and of Michoacan, our respects and our religious esteem.

In the interview mentioned above, a suggestion was made that the Peace Conference give consideration to Mexico. Evidently this idea is meeting with some favor from Mexicans, for Francisco de la Barra, sometime Provisional President of the unhappy country, declares that opinion in Mexico is favorable to the idea of the League of Nations and is desirous of participating in its formation.

Meantime conditions in Mexico do not show much improvement. The country is in a state of absolute bankruptcy, and the bandits are active. These headings from different Mexican papers well illustrate the latter fact:

Chaotic Conditions

National R. R.: Rebels threaten traffic at kilo 495 near Uruapam. Rebels threaten Uruapam. January 2, 1919. Central R. R.: Rebels threaten traffic at kilo 365 Monterey Division, near Vaqueros station. Telegraph line destroyed. January 2, 1919. Mexican Central: Rebels attacked Jimenez, were repulsed and

pursued. It is stated also that numerous adventurers from the United States have joined Villa's forces, which have therefore redoubled their activities. Rebels threaten neighborhood of Chihuahua. Rebels threaten traffic between Jimenez and Parral. Traffic very deficient. Telegraph lines: There is no connection north of Santa Barbara, Chihuahua Division. There is deficient service in the Division. Partial interruption between Moctezuma and Juarez and between Sauz and Juarez. Inter-oceanic R. R.: Rebels attacked and destroyed Tecoc station. Mexican R. R.: Rebels attacked detachment at Muñoz station. Mexican R. R.: Rebels attacked freight train at Purca station, having destroyed several cars with merchandise. Four tank cars with fuel oil were derailed and one car with horses was robbed. January 3, 1919. Veracruz to the Isthmus R. R.: At 9 p. m. extra exploring train, No. 12, was attacked at Carmen station on the Veracruz to the Isthmus R. R. Rebels removed rail and three cars derailed. January 4, 1919. Mexican Central R. R.: Zapatistas destroyed railway south of Ajusco. Telegraph line grounded. Central R. R.: Rebels attacked Ajusco today at 11:30 a. m. Traffic delayed. January 8, 1919. Mexican R. R.: Rebels threaten traffic on Puebla branch. Traffic delayed. Veracruz to the Isthmus R. R.: Rebels destroyed telegraph line between Los Changos and Los Naranjos. Kilo 118-119. January 9, 1919. National R. R.: Small parties of thieves robbed wire at Kilo 79, Mexico Queretaro division. North of Boyjay five sections of wire were stolen. January 10, 1919. Mexican Central R. R.: Mixed train towards Cuernavaca derailed today between Cima and El Parque. Zapatistas threaten road. January 11, 1919. Xico and San Rafael R. R.: Zapatistas attacked yesterday Chalco station, having been repulsed. Mexican R. R.: It is again said that the Mexican R. R. will be delivered to its owners and that all trains will run protected by the English flag. January 11, 1919.

This deplorable condition cannot be remedied until Carranza assumes a more benevolent attitude. This he is now inclined to do, but announcements of his benevolent intentions towards Catholics are, to say the least, a little premature.

Rome.—Publicists in France and elsewhere have been deducing logical conclusions from the premises laid down by M. Poincaré, the President of the French Republic, in the speech in which he solemnly inaugurated the Peace Conference:

Liberty for the Pope

Little by little the war has come to be understood in the fullness of the meaning which it had from the very beginning, and it is now accepted in the completest sense of the word as a crusade of humanity in support of right. . . . You the delegates to the Conference are intent on establishing justice, justice without favoritism. . . . To all peoples, constituted as States or to be restored to the dignity of statehood, you will make every endeavor, as perforce, to assure the material and moral means of existence. . . . You will bring to the world the greatest harmony possible.

It was with this magnificent program that the Peace Conference opened, and under its inspiration the oppressed the world over have renewed their hopes and appealed for justice, including Poland, Armenia, Ireland, the Jews, the Mexican Episcopate and others. This being the case, *Franc*, writing in *La Croix*, has made an appeal that an end be put to the intolerable situation of the Pope on the ground that the international character of the Holy Father with his millions of subjects in every

quarter of the world necessarily calls for the fullest liberty of action. *L'Action Catholique* of Quebec in its issue of February 15 has also taken up the question and protested against the spoliation and the imprisonment of which Pope Leo XIII., Pius IX. and Pius X. did not cease to complain for the space of fifty years. The words of Benedict XV., spoken in his allocation of December 6, 1915, put the difficulty of his position, as shown by actual events, very clearly:

Ambassadors and Ministers accredited to the Vatican have been obliged to withdraw to safeguard their personal dignity and the prerogatives of their offices. The consequence has been that the Holy See, because the necessary guarantees were lacking, has been deprived of its rights. For the same reason we have been deprived of the accustomed and ready means of communicating with foreign governments. We have seen ourselves exposed, and it has caused us great sorrow, to suspicions of listening only to the suggestions of those who had the means of reaching us. Over and beyond all this are the growing difficulty of holding communication with the Catholic world and the serious obstacles which have made it difficult for us to be correctly informed on current events.

L'Action Catholique sums up the case for the Papacy as follows:

The Papal action will have its full efficacy only in the case that it is in position to disarm all suspicion as regards the means it may deem wise to take to secure the salvation of souls. To prevent suspicion and doubts as to partiality, it is necessary that the person of the Pope should be free from all political jurisdiction, and be so placed as to be above all rival factions and all international disputes. "It is not sufficient that the Pope should enjoy freedom in the interior forum, it is essential that he should be manifestly at liberty, that his liberty should be evident to the outside world, that every one should know and believe that he is untrammelled in his action, and that nothing should give ground for doubts or suspicions as to the reality of his liberty." This conviction, if it is to be entertained by the Christian people, in regard to the Holy See, demands that the Papacy should be absolutely free from any forced subjection or subordination to any civil régime. In this matter there is involved not merely the honor of the Church, but the interests of consciences, the future of religion, and the peace and security of Catholics throughout the world.

Catholics all over the world have it very much at heart that this essential liberty of action should be accorded to the Papacy. At the same time it should be remembered that, when the propaganda carried on by the Central Powers was foisting on the public notice the idea of forcible restoration of the temporal power of the Pope, Cardinal Gasparri found it opportune and necessary to declare that at the Vatican "there was no thought of seeking the restoration of the rights of the Holy See through the aid of foreign bayonets." The *Revue Pratique D'Apologetique* quotes the anti-clerical *Giornale d'Italia* to show that even the enemies of the Pope in Italy recognized that he was no less a patriotic Italian than a conscientious head of the Church. Obscurity enshrouds the subject of Mr. Wilson's conversations at the Vatican and especially his interview with Pope Benedict XV., but it is inconceivable that his influence in consulting the interests of right and justice will not be strongly exerted where

the interests of 200,000,000 Catholics are concerned. Perhaps some such meaning attaches to the words of M. Orlando, spoken in the Italian Senate: "The Catholic clergy of Italy have not forgotten that they are Italians, and we shall endeavor not to forget the fact." The *Catholic Universe* of London insists that the "Roman Question" is occupying the minds of all diplomats, and of Italian diplomats in particular, and finds reason for believing that events are moving in the direction of peace being established between Italy and the Vatican. It is emphatic, however, in its warning that the details of the settlement are a matter that can be determined only by the Vatican, and that undue discussion of them might prove injurious to the cause. Perhaps this warning was inspired by the letter recently sent by Cardinal Gasparri to the *Osservatore Romano* in protest against certain proposed settlements advocated by the Italian clericals.

Russia.—The Senatorial investigation that has been going on at Washington regarding the nature of Russian Bolshevism has brought out the fact that a large number of the chief agitators are apostate Jews from the East Side of New York who went back to Russia immediately after the overthrow of the Czar. The Rev. Dr. George S. Simons, who has recently returned from Russia and who was up before the Investigating Committee the middle of February, testified that:

The Bolshevik is not only an atheist but he also seeks to make all religions impossible. They assert that all misery is due to the superstition that there is a God. One of their officials told me: "We now propose to enlighten our children, and with this purpose in view, we are issuing a catechism on atheism for use in all the schools." The man who told me this was the Commissaire for Enlightenment and Education.

Thousands upon thousands of them [the middle classes] have been starved to death. I have seen the walking shadows of these dying human beings in the streets of Petrograd. Thousands have dropped dead in their tracks. I have seen them myself. I have seen some of the finest men of the old days standing starving in the streets and with outstretched hands begging a few kopecks. I have been in the homes of the best people of Petrograd, in which there has been no bread for weeks.

There is a large criminal element in the Bolshevik regime. The fact that the criminal has a big part in the movement is proved by the destruction in a public bonfire of court records, the destruction of prisons and the liberation of all criminals who are sympathetic with the cause. We know it to be a fact that some of the worst criminal characters in all Russia hold positions under the Bolshevik Government, while others are helping as agitators.

Dr. W. C. Huntington, formerly Commercial Attaché of the American Embassy at Petrograd, deposed that not more than eight per cent of the Russian people were in favor of the Bolsheviks, but were terrorized into submission.

The genuineness of the disgraceful Soviet decrees, ordering the "nationalization" of women, which have already been cited in these columns, were also attested to by witnesses the commission questioned.

The Rocks Ahead

J. C. WALSH

Staff Correspondent of AMERICA

AT the meeting at which the League of Nations' proposals were formally placed before the Peace Conference M. Clemenceau was cross. It was the representatives of the small nations, and especially one from Belgium, who felt the effect, but the Paris gossips would have it that it was Mr. Wilson who was really to blame. The President's offence consisted in talking about his peace project in the same terms as he employed before leaving home, thus serving notice that none of the blandishments of which his hosts in the European capitals have been prodigal have had any effect. So far from seeing things as they see them, he has become, if anything, more aggressive in his assertion of those of his ideals which in this part of the world are unpopular, because they tend to interfere with the progress of more practical affairs.

The fact is that there is a silent struggle going on all the time. The bulk of the delegates are here to achieve the purposes of the Governments they represent. Mr. Wilson insists that in this matter of putting an end to war the peoples are more important than civil governors and military staffs. Day after day the civil governors and the military staffs pursue their aims and advance their projects. Then, at intervals of disquieting frequency, this unmanageable President interrupts with a message which is heard by the peoples everywhere, which encourages the peoples to insist upon their rights, and which is therefore an occasion of great annoyance to those who care very little for the views of any people except their own.

These messages, moreover, are carried to the peoples. American enterprise has seen to that. The world is covered at this moment by a system of wireless stations partly or wholly under the control of the American Bureau of Information, and this convenience serves, despite the hopeless congestion of cable services, to carry the news into the remotest corners. American collectors and distributors of information are busily at work on all those out-of-the-way places which are supposed to be cut off from the benefits of civilization, and with the help of the wireless they are able at once to supply the American Peace Commission with first-hand information in great volume and inversely to see that the work and purposes of the President is everywhere made known. Ten days ago there was a feeling that the protracted delays were far from being accidental; that important matters were being kept in the stage of undevelopment until such time as cruel necessity should compel Mr. Wilson to leave Paris for home. After that, various agreements already partially made could be put through with necessary modifications. Into this atmosphere of serene expectation came the President's speech with its renewed appeal to

the peoples over the heads of the Governments and its warning against assumption of the continued ability of strong States to impose their will upon weak States anywhere.

In all the speeches that were made that day, and it was by all odds the most oratorical session yet held, there was no echo to the sentiments expressed by Mr. Wilson. Mr. Lloyd George indicated his real mind when he said that even if the effort they were making did not succeed, the fact that they made the effort would itself be worth while. Those familiar with Mr. Lloyd George's history and methods know what this means. It is the same language he used towards the Irish Convention. It means that every latitude will be allowed Mr. Wilson and every facility afforded for the discussion of his projects during the time that must elapse before a host of practical questions can be advanced to their desired solution, and that when that phase has been reached the Wilson ideology will be bidden farewell in terms suited to the degree of amenability shown by the Americans while practical business was under review. M. Bourgeois was more friendly, for M. Bourgeois has views of his own on the possibility of keeping the peace through concerted action by Governments and by the resort to courts, but he nowhere yielded to the Wilsonian gospel of putting the peoples ahead of their Governments. The other speakers contented themselves with paying compliments to France when they were not busy urging their own claims. M. Clemenceau lost his temper, which would not have happened if Mr. Wilson's speech had filled him with enough delight to last the season through. The President, in fact, was left in a position of splendid isolation—in the house of the Plenipotentiaries.

However, the study of the actual proposals has been officially launched. The plans submitted are understood to have many features in common. The present Conference will lay a foundation for the work of the League by entering into a number of conventions designed to make joint action practicable. Not much is heard about right and justice except in respect to matters in which Germany is still an object of censure or suspicion, but there is to be one convention in which conceptions of right will be stereotyped. It is a convention in regard to territorial boundaries. There will be conventions also about labor, use of rivers, international railways, use of ports, and half a dozen other matters which recognize a certain community of interest in air, sea and land, but they will be based on expediency rather than on right. There will be a convention to provide for the establishment of an international judiciary. There will even be a convention for the rationing of arms and munitions to small Powers suspected of over-development of combative instincts. All

this gives an air of realism to the talk of insuring peace. There are some other aspects of the subject, however, which are not so reassuring.

Most of us have been assuming that the League is to assure the preservation of peace, not merely between small States, but also between great Powers. Indeed, humanity has a far more profound objection to a great war than to a little one, for the excellent reason that a great war drags everybody in. So far as can be inferred from the interpretive speeches of men like M. Bourgeois and Lord Robert Cecil, the plans so far under consideration are very limited in their application to the great Powers. They have, indeed, one feature in common. States which are members of the League must not make war without submitting their claims to some form of hearing, which may be before an arbitration tribunal or may be before an international tribunal, or may be before a conference of all the members of the League, or may be before a council representing the five great Powers now allied. A State must not make war while this hearing is on, or within three months after a decision, on penalty of having all the others against it. So far, no doubt, the provision is all to the good. But it should be well understood that the only unpardonable crime so far contemplated is that of going to war without submitting to delays. After these delays have been incurred, new and dangerous conditions arise.

M. Bourgeois contends that when a decision has been rendered it ought to be enforced. That seems to the layman the logical course, and the French are nothing if not logical. But there are others who prefer being practical to being logical, and there is more than an even chance that M. Bourgeois will not secure general assent to his apparently sensible proposal that if an issue comes before a court the decision of the court must be enforced by all the power of the League against the party which declines to comply with the decision. If that party makes war, the League will be against it; but if that party simply declines to conform to the finding, then nothing may happen. Before the argument is ended some of the Powers represented at Paris, perhaps even France, will refuse to be bound by an adverse judgment and will refuse to be bound in advance to enforce a judgment. This is the first rock upon which the League may founder.

There is a more serious difficulty. If once the possibility of war becomes manifest, the great Powers must, under all projects so far advanced, confer about the case. If they are unanimous, well and good. Then there will

either be no war, or the forces arrayed against any peace-breaker will be overwhelming. But if the great Powers are not unanimous, then what happens? Here, evidently, interest enters as well as right and justice. Right and justice may be estimated, as has happened before, on the side of interest. About all that can be said to be agreed upon at present is that in such a case the majority of the spokesmen of the great Powers will write, sign and publish a report—nothing more. One can imagine a case in which Italy, Japan and France might make a majority report, the view of America and Great Britain being contrary. Then there could be war. It would be sure to be the worst kind of a war, arranged for by all the old kind of alliances, but it would be a war against which, so far, no League of Nations contemplates any objection.

It is easy to see whither this leads. Granted that the preliminary hearings and delays might, and probably would, avert hostilities, nevertheless it is impossible to see how any of the five great Powers could forego the resort to any means necessary to secure its position against such an eventuality. Hence, no disarmament on principle; no limitation of naval construction except in a degree consistent with security; no let-up in the study of the manner in which scientific discoveries might be made available for war. Ration of liquor to negro States, yes. Ration of arms to Balkan States, yes. Suppression of armament in conquered countries, perhaps. But disarmament among the great Powers themselves, no. Here is the second rock on which the League may go to pieces.

Undoubtedly it is because he foresees the dangers which would beset a League so based upon the interest of States and affected by the rivalries of governments that Mr. Wilson seeks a method whose foundations would be more secure. He bases his conception, not on the single element of right inherent in territorial possession, based upon success in war, but upon the permanent elements of right and justice associated with the conception of freedom as applied to peoples. Just in what manner he will be able to make the substitution of his method for the one now holding the field he may know, or he may not. Disclosure of the weakness of other schemes may give him the chance to bring forward his. At present his tactics seem to be to keep the peoples of the world interested in the ideals which are common to him and to them until the time comes, if it does come, when the opportunity for attempting a translation into practice shall arrive. Meanwhile the old school is patiently going along on a road he proclaims his intention not to travel.

Mexico and the Peace Congress at Paris

M. B. DOWNING

AT El Paso, Texas, *el Paso del Norte* of Oñate's expedition of 1598, the most ancient gateway from the unhappy land of Montezuma to the United States, there are portentous signs. It is no longer prob-

lematic whether representatives of Mexico will sit at the peace table. Discussions now relate to the most efficacious method of presenting to the august tribunal which essays to place the entire world on an enduring peace basis.

every phase of the Mexican question from the first visible signs of revolt against Diaz to the soul-trying conditions of the present. The treaty of peace which will be drawn up at Paris by the Chief Magistrate of the United States and other illustrious statesmen, must submit to one supreme test, and that is whether all its terms have been dictated by justice and fair-dealing towards all the people of the earth, of the small nations as well as of the great nations. This is the paramount issue which will decide whether the signatories have fulfilled the glorious promise made to suffering humanity.

It is admitted that the existing Government in Mexico shows no enthusiasm over placing its internal affairs before the judicial body which is studying the vital problems involved in countries where revolution perpetually stalks abroad. There are those who prate loudly of the principle of self-determination as the mighty barrier which looms up between the rulers of Mexico and the peace-makers in Paris. However, it is likewise conceded that Mexico does not relish exclusion from the League of Nations and she must play the game according to the rules.

But it is this principle of self-determination, the weak spot in the Carranza constitutional structure, which will hale his country before the conferees in Versailles. Leading jurists of the world have taken up the weapon of Wilson's doctrine to force an entrance to the Conference even against the will of Carranza, should he resist. There are now in Paris some twenty or more delegates from the United States and other nations which have suffered injustice: Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Japan, China, the Netherlands and many of the Latin Republics. Their main grievance is not so much the violation of international guarantees, as the new Mexican Constitution which became operative on May 1, 1917. The legal mind has announced a verdict against Carranza's pet instrument which is reminiscent of Bernard Shaw's explanation of the perpetual warfare between Downing Street and the leaders of the Nationalist party in Dublin: "An Englishman can never understand an Irishman because he is an Englishman." The Mexican Constitution is rejected because it is unconstitutional, and to permit its operation is to invite the menace of civil war, present and future. Constitutionals will always have a cause to plead against the powers that be, for according to every law which has hitherto applied to the constitutions and the amended constitutions of nations, the delegates who met at Carranza's bidding in January, 1917, were without authority. It is charitable to describe their elections as farcical. The old instrument of 1857, which the present Constitution of Mexico presumably supplants, says in the 127th Article: "No amendment shall become part of the Constitution unless agreed upon by the Congress of the Union by a vote of two-thirds of the members present and later approved by the majority of the legislatures of the States."

The most fervid Carranza adherent can claim no such

sanction for the document of May 1, 1917, unless in his flight of oratory to convince some poor gringos for the nonce. It would be interesting if some serious and well-informed member of the presidential entourage would announce the number of States which approved Carranza's amendments, with the date and general personnel of the legislative assemblies. The history of the election of those members of Congress, who built up that most amazing Constitution, the longest and most radical, as well as the most involved, charter ever written for a nation, will be among the items which these representatives of violated interests in Mexico will lay before the world tribunal for peace. If Article 127 of the Constitution of 1857 were not sufficient to emphasize the invalidity of the present Mexican law, there is Article 128, which reads: "This Constitution shall not lose its force and vigor even if its observance is interrupted by revolution."

In El Paso, where the reign of terror spread by blood-thirsty factions has been succeeded by the dreariness of waiting for better times, by the specter of famine and pestilence which threatens all classes of refugees, by the sickening drain on every municipal resource as well as on private charity, several opinions prevail. But all expect action in Paris, while none cast doubt on the fact that Paris will act at last. There are thousands of worthy citizens in El Paso, as in all the border cities, San Antonio and Eagle Pass, Texas, and Nogales, Arizona, who talk bitterly against the United States for permitting chaotic conditions to continue so long and who still sternly demand intervention as the only permanent way to peace. To them the Peace Congress is a figure of speech, whereas the overseas soldiers would be a convincing argument. There are many, however, who see the dawn of happier times in the day-by-day report which comes from the tribunal sitting in the old court city of France. These pin their hopes to the principle of self-determination. Thousands upon thousands of Mexicans were in exile when that law of May 1, 1917, was framed. Their inalienable right remains and Carranza cannot deprive them of it. Take the case of the recent elections in Germany. Every German except the Kaiser and the Crown Prince and a few other Hohenzollern men and women were permitted to vote. By what authority could Carranza cast out thousands of Mexican votes, sometimes the vote of entire counties, because they were hostile to his interests? When that august assemblage in Versailles speaks, it will be seen that the First Chief has no right which will hold.

There are others who fear that to overthrow the present Mexican Constitution would be to plunge the unhappy country deeper into civil war. This group thinks that salvation rests on the judicial body which Mexico must appoint to adjudicate the claims of aliens within her territory, violated without regard to international conventions. Here too lies hope for amelioration in some degree, but it does not touch that burning wrong done

religion. Yet nearly all the great nations which have solemn claims against the Mexican Republic for broken commercial treaties and ignored private contracts have also a higher claim on account of injustices done their citizens who had entered the land to preach the Gospel. Two or three years ago it was the fashion for the man in the street in El Paso to wag his head mysteriously and say that the Catholic Church had played politics and had lost; hence it was paying the usual penalty. Time has proved this to be but part of the political propaganda employed ceaselessly by Carranzistas, akin to that of certain Americans who at times harp upon the wolves of Wall Street or the evil of Tammany. El Pasoans acknowledge the truth at last. More than a score of conservative men, bankers, lawyers, physicians and journalists have told the same story. The Catholic Church in Mexico was persecuted because its possessions were coveted. In order to deprive it of ownership of its goods, it was necessary to trump up false charges and to cling to those calumnies despite every sort of proof to the contrary. It is not just clear whether the conferees at Paris have arms long and strong enough to grasp these despoilers of right and justice. But the moral victory of the Church is mighty and hope is revived by the fact that the truth is spreading along the border and creating a reaction among Americans, which is prophetic of the end. Then there is nothing more inspiring than to study the history of similar campaigns against truth and the Church which Christ founded on the Rock.

Ad interim, El Paso is one of the boom cities of the nation. It is estimated that its population has almost trebled since 1915 when the refugees began to come in alarming numbers. An official census was taken in 1916 at the request of the Chamber of Commerce, in order to determine what drain the city and county was suffering because of the fleeing hundreds across the international bridge. Then it was found that from 39,279 in 1910, the population has grown to 61,898 in 1916. Of these more than 35,000 were Mexicans and to them were to be added 8,000 refugees permanently established, and groups of two or three thousand others annually seeking temporary asylum. In the past three years the refugees have trebled, for only those who cross at the international bridge figure in the official lists. But the boundary line is long and the waters of the Rio Grande shallow and those who must feed the hungry mouths, know accurately how much greater is the actual than the alleged number. There are few sights more pitiable than these fugitive Mexicans. What a commentary on the generosity of the nation which fought that the world might be free and happy, to see these hordes of hungry, ragged, homeless exiles! Why should the charity which compassed all for the Belgians, the Serbians, the Armenians be so indifferent to the neighbors of the South, to the thousands of sufferers upon our own soil?

The Associated Charities of El Paso and large-souled citizens have done much, but on the Church authorities

the burden has been at all times beyond endurance. The Bishop of El Paso, the Rt. Reverend Anthony J. Schuler, will stand out against the racking times in clear-cut lines. He performs his duties quietly and unostentatiously, yet with a sympathy and vigor that are surprising. From such a practical, prosperous community as may be found in Elk County, Pennsylvania, he came to the Southwest in his early manhood and has given these rather dreamy Latins a splendid service. Ninety-five per cent of the people of his diocese are of Mexican lineage, and not of the opulent type. Yet he has fed and sheltered a multitude out of his slender resources and he has sustained his faltering clergy by the fire of his zeal.

It would be valuable to receive exact figures of the refugee Belgians who received continuous aid from any one English bishop, or from any one French dignitary, in the cases of fugitives from the devastated regions to the interior of France. There is an aged and destitute exile, Rt. Rev. Francesco Uranga, formerly Bishop of Sinaloa, who can tell how much he and unnumbered other Mexicans owe to the piety and benevolence of the chief shepherd in El Paso. Another figure which stands out luminously is that of the Rev. Cruz M. Garde, S. J., a distinguished scholar who was doing excellent educational and literary work when the storm broke. Father Garde is a Spaniard, a native of the Basque provinces. He devotes himself untiringly to the exiles in cooperation with the fathers attached to the Church of the Sacred Heart, in a poor district known as "Little Chihuahua." His splendid paper, *La Revista Católica*, is continuing the good work of keeping the record.

At this writing, according to reliable information, there is not a single priest in the entire State of Chihuahua discharging parochial service. Another heavy burden does the Bishop shoulder, in endeavoring to have ready priests who will give some spiritual comfort to these distracted and unhappy people. To see the bowed, black-veiled women who sit sometimes all day in the dark old church of Chihuahua, or the broken, hopeless men who crowd Father Garde's study, is to realize the magnitude of the service which Bishop Schuler and his priests are performing so modestly and so efficiently.

Yet the Carranzista press keeps up the fiction of peace and prosperity in the greater part of the country. So peaceful and prosperous is the country that but two main lines of railroad keep fairly regular schedules, from Laredo to the valley of Mexico and from the port of Vera Cruz to the same destination. So well-restored is order that after dark the trains creep along with darkened windows, for fear of the peons who love Carranza and his Government so much that they never overlook an opportunity to smash car-windows and to wound travelers, all in the hope of adding more trouble to a regime which already has woes enough to overwhelm it. Ruined churches, schools and railroad stations tell eloquently of restored order, while in nearly all the greater towns there

are markets and the junkshops that offer for sale exquisite altar vessels and embroidered vestments. Everywhere is shuddering talk of bandits, and certainly the daily press of the United States bears out the reasonableness of these fears. Though Villa rides at will and robs, burns and murders, there are thousands of so-called bandits who are but hungry Indians or peons who seek only enough to keep themselves alive. Yet Mexico is a land where economists boast ten square feet of ground

will support a man and his family comfortably. Coffee bushes, orange trees and bananas are provided by the bounty of nature. Only those who traverse the stricken land south from Juarez can realize the truth. The impatience and desire for vengeance on the perpetrators of these evils which are so visible in El Paso are readily understood. It is clear, then, that Paris must act on the Mexican question. If Paris does not act, what will become of Mexico?

Ethics, Not Religion

DANIEL A. LORD, S.J.

IF the American mind possesses one marked characteristic, it is positiveness. We are not mental cowards; we do not dodge issues; we take a definite position, the Monroe Doctrine, for instance, or the Emancipation Proclamation, and we face calmly and with clear vision the consequences of our attitude.

Certainly, then, it would be no credit to the fathers of our new American Church if it were the only negative thing about us. Yet thus far in our brief study of that proposed institution we have found nothing positive; it has neither the power nor the apparent inclination to propose a definite system of belief. On all the questions that lie deep in every religious soul it has simply nothing to say. So far our American Church has been sheer negation.

Conscious of this lack of anything positive to offer on the subject of God or eternity or the soul, the prophets of the new faith have taken to themselves the fine-sounding phrases that have come to be the stock in trade of every reformer no matter what his platform of reformation. The new Church, they say, is to be based on the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. It is to be firm in its adherence to the ideals of fraternity and humanity. "Love, loyalty and life," as Dr. Miller puts it, "are the things about which men will care immensely." The bond that is to unite the members of our new Church is not the bond of creed or wordy formula. It is the glorious consciousness that all men are brothers, with God for a common Father; that only by love, loyalty, and service can we be worthy of a place in civilized society.

This sounds rather splendid, yet once more we must pause before giving our assent. These beautiful phrases may be as pregnant with meaning as they were when Christ first enunciated them to the wondering crowds in Judea, or they may be as hollow as the mouthings of a broken actor. And it is only when they ring with the meaning that Christ put into them that they can have any real significance or worth or beauty.

The beautiful ideal of God, our common Father, is essentially a Christian belief, based on very definite dogmas. To a pagan of Rome or Greece the thought of Jove as father in any but the most disgraceful sense would have been quite inconceivable. The idea of God's father-

hood to man is based on the Christian dogma of sanctifying grace, which in turn supposes the dogmas of creation, original sin, and redemption by the Incarnate Son of God. By creation we are God's servants; we become God's adopted sons by the infusion into the soul of sanctifying grace won for us through the merits of Christ. By this grace we are regenerated, justified, restored to the Divine friendship, given a certain participation in the Divine nature, and thus, by a new and ineffable nativity, are transferred from the state of mere creatures to the state of the adopted sons of God, a favor which carries with it the right to possess God's kingdom, as heirs to a celestial heritage. It was a marvelous act of Divine benevolence by which God became our creator; it was a still more marvelous act of Divine benevolence by which he became our Father.

The phrase, the Fatherhood of God, is meaningless and void unless back of it lie these essentially Christian dogmas. By what right, then, does the new Church use it so glibly? Are we to infer that it really holds and teaches the fundamental doctrines of creation, redemption, and sanctification? Are these really essential beliefs in which all the sects unite? As a matter of fact some sects question the first dogma; some deny the second, and others know nothing of the third. The new Church has no intention of giving them this meaning, as will be sufficiently clear in a moment.

No more would the world in the time of Rome have understood a doctrine that makes brothers of patrician and plebeian, freedman and slave. It took distinctly Christian dogmas to make that idea conceivable. If we are brothers, as St. Paul says, Christ is elder Brother of us all; if, as Christ taught, we pray to our common Father in heaven, it is because in our souls there is a supernatural family resemblance, conferred by sanctifying grace merited for us by Christ's redemption. Is, then, the American Church, which cries so loudly for the brotherhood of man, implicitly holding all the while these essentially Christian dogmas, without which the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man are empty of meaning.

As for loyalty and love, we must ask toward whom that loyalty and love are to be shown. Toward God? That implies the dogmas that God is our ruler and that

we owe Him loyalty; that He is good and merits our love. This would be an odd meaning in a Church that holds no dogmas. Toward country and friends? One scarcely needs religion to bring home that duty. Toward wife and family? That is a dictate of the natural law recognized by the veriest pagan.

The new American Church, then, has caught up a number of phrases, beautiful when fraught with the meaning they have from Christian dogma but as meaningless on the lips of a creedless religion as an infant's repetition of its mother's cooings. Of course, we have learned from years of bitter experience that it is distinctly profitable to oneself to help one's neighbor. We have learned that charity is the most perfect form of self-protection. But if that is all the American Church means when it uses these beautiful phrases its mission has ceased to be supernatural and has become purely utilitarian. Love your neighbor because that is the surest way to make your neighbor love you.

That the American Church's mission has ceased to be supernatural in the minds of many of its propagators is quite clear from the ideal that all Americans, Jews, Christians, Agnostics, Atheists, shall ultimately be included in the generous fold of the great American Church. While time may not have been wasted in the vain attempt to find some spiritual bond between the sects, it would be prodigally squandered in an endeavor to search out anything supernatural to bind together those who believe in nothing supernatural. They could, as any pagan could, accept the beautiful phrases eulogizing fraternity and humanity and loyalty and love, provided that no Christian dogmas lay back of them. They, too, have learned the value of these things. But if they are to be admitted to fellowship in the American Church, they must be admitted on the acceptance of these phrases in their most natural, utilitarian sense. And the founders of the Church apparently intend to ask nothing more of them.

Our great American Church becomes, then, nothing more than a diluted ethical society that preaches brotherhood of men and love and loyalty because in the end these are the things that will make this world a better place to live in, far less exposed to the horrors of vice and poverty and the crimes whose common father is selfishness. No one denies for a moment that even this is something well worth striving for. We all feel gratitude toward the man, no matter who he is, that helps this world one step farther into the sunlight. But an institution that sets its aim altogether on improving this world and casts not even a casual eye on eternity has no right whatsoever to the name of religion. It is a benevolent society, a charitable institution, as you will. But only the most haphazard use of terms can allow the words "church" or "religion" to be applied to it.

Promoters of this Church of negation are fond of speaking of Americans as an essentially religious people. But, they hasten to add, their faith is inarticulate, vague,

a thing of personal experiences and emotions not to be put in cold words. By this they seem to mean that a man is religious who feels stirred emotionally by the sight of tall mountains, by the sighing of the wind through the trees, by wonderful music and pictures; who feels his pulses quickened when he looks down into the eyes of youthful innocence, and who is touched to a ready sympathy by rags and the cry of a bruised mortal. It makes no difference if his mind never turns to God or harbors so much as a crumb of thought about eternity. Religion is not of these things. And the new Church will be broad enough to welcome to itself all these millions, no matter how vague, indeterminate or contradictory their beliefs.

Let us lay aside once and for all this hypocrisy. Let us dare use terms in the sense in which those terms are properly understood. A man who has the qualities mentioned may be a "naturally good man," but it is a plain misuse of terms to call him religious. Religion has always meant the definite relation between God and man; it has been bound up with the spirit of prayer and sacrifice and a charity based not on the fact that the giver is naturally kind-hearted or quick to be offended at dirt and misery, but on the fact that charity is of God. A man who gives freely of his goods because he pities his neighbor is a naturally generous man; but if during the course of a lifetime he never bows his head in prayer to the God who has a right to demand his praise, he is not in any sense religious.

In the same way our prophets of the new American Church are tampering with the word "religion" when they offer us an institution which has neither creed nor worship but only a few vague phrases that any just Atheist might, in a limited, utilitarian sense, accept.

They must cast out of their Church anything that might offend any of the sects they wish to unite. They aim to include even those who would decline anything spiritual were it offered to them. So be it. Make the new creed broad enough even for that. Admit to membership anyone who is naturally just and kind and decent in the sight of the community. But if this is to be the character of the new body, drop all these fine platitudes about faith in God and the Saviour and heaven. Cease posing in the public eye as a great spiritual organization and admit the true character as a vast philanthropic body that asks of its members neither faith nor worship, and that promises them in return nothing but the good things that earth can give.

It is base pharisaism to put forth as a Christian religion a society that no refined Greek or decent pagan of modern times could justly decline to enter. To offer such an institution in place of the old faiths and worships is an attempt, possibly unintentional, to hoodwink the religious-minded of the country. Religion, by the common consent of mankind, has its roots in the supernatural; by giving up its right to the supernatural, our great American Church will at once cease to be in any true sense either a church or a religion.

The Dogma of Evolution

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

THE popular materialistic scientific creed of the nineteenth century can be briefly summarized in this manner. In the beginning was matter. To this was added, in some occult and forever inexplicable way, force, which eventuated in motion. Hence materialistic evolution. Hence the world without God. The Creator was no longer needed; the lights of heaven were extinguished. This doctrine continued in favor at the beginning of the twentieth century, but a strong reaction on the part of scientific men had already set in. Its effects, however, could not be stayed so readily. They worked out their wreck and ruin in the world war and its bloody aftermath, the Bolshevik reign of terror. Might is right, if there is no God.

No creed was ever so dogmatic as materialistic evolution, and no creed was ever more utterly devoid of every vestige of evidence and reason, as scientists are daily more ready to concede. The blind acceptance of it among all classes of society indicated the credulity of which men are capable, when deprived of the one sure stay of faith. To question it was ignorance. To differ from it was heresy. To accept any other dogma was superstitious. To dare appear in print without subscribing to its articles was certain to result in scientific ostracism. Thus the great work of Professor Dwight, anticipating the scientific conclusions of the following decade, was tacitly ignored because of its very title: "Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist." The reign of materialistic evolution, extending its sway over scientific circles, schools and popular literature, was in brief the worst and most disastrous autocracy of the nineteenth century, the autocracy of unreason.

All that had ever existed, would or could exist, was for it merely a changing form of matter. From nebula to man, from the lowest clod to the highest genius, from the basest and most criminal passion to the tenderest emotion of a mother's love, from the turning of a worm to the rapture of a saint, all was purely a physical and chemical process. "The human mind itself," wrote Tyndall, "emotion, will, intellect, and all their phenomena, were once latent in a fiery cloud." Plato, Shakespeare, Newton, Raphael, he declared to an admiring age, are even now potential in the fires of the sun. Out of lifeless matter they had developed in common with the toad or reptile by no other power than material evolution. Thousands of such statements might be quoted at random. Strangest of all, they were believed with an absolute submission of reason, although never based on any such evidences of credibility as the Church offers with convincing force to make reasonable the acceptance of her claims.

Out of the blazing cloud of warring atoms and through the welter of a miry earth, man evolved: first a primal cell, then a structureless jelly, and so through evolution

after evolution to his present form. "Life is but an arrangement of matter, so as to live," says Edward Clodd, a popular purveyor of evolutionary lore, "mind is but an arrangement, so as to think. The chemic lump arrives at the plant and grows; arrives at the quadruped and walks; arrives at the man and thinks." All is so delightfully simple, so dogmatically certain!

Yet long before the world war had broken out the number of scientists who looked upon the common evolutionary origin of all plant and animal life as a mere figment of the imagination was constantly increasing. The fabulous lines of descent by which such authors as Haeckel had traced man back to the primary cell were already considered, by evolutionists themselves, no less mythical than the lists of Homeric heroes. There is at least an historic foundation for the Homeric epics. There is none whatsoever for the materialistic evolutionary dogmatism.

Summing up the doctrine of one of the most scientific of evolutionists of our day, we find that the theory of evolution affords us no certainty whatsoever. It offers at the most a measure of probability, within rather indefinite limits. The more closely plants or animals can be scientifically classed together, the greater the evolutionary probability. The more remote they are from each other, the less is that probability, until it finally vanishes altogether. More than this cannot be claimed with scientific accuracy by any evolutionist. Whether we ourselves are willing to accept even this much must depend entirely upon the appeal which the fragmentary facts offered in proof may make upon us. But for this purpose we must first be able to set aside the countless false statements, presentations of mere theories as facts and the endless special pleading in which the literature upon this subject abounds.

Indeed, if we are to trust some of the more eminent evolutionists there is no cogency of evidence to compel us to believe that any evolutionary change from even a single species to another has ever occurred. As has been said, this statement, strange as it may seem to readers of evolutionary literature, is not based on the mere say-so of theologians, but on the highest evolutionary authority that can be quoted. Darwin himself makes it in the clearest and most express terms. In a letter written to Bentham he says: "*When we descend to details, we cannot prove that a single species has changed.*" This sober confession will greatly offset the positiveness of many of his other assertions. The evidence for descent, says Professor Kellogg, is of "*purely logical character.*"

Darwin differed from his followers in that he was not a dogmatist on the subject of evolution as applied to the existence of God. The same cannot be said of the numerous authors of the textbooks of science, history and sociology, who set forth materialistic evolution as a final and infallible doctrine. Through them the pernicious creed of materialistic evolution, the most intolerant instance of unreasoning dogmatism history has ever known,

was introduced into the secular institutions of higher learning throughout Europe and America. Thence it filtered down to the masses and was finally popularized in novels and Sunday supplements, in general histories, in social literature and Socialist propaganda. Evolution, Huxley triumphantly exclaimed, "in addition to its truth," which science has shown to be non-existent in the sense proclaimed by him, "has the great merit of being in a position of irreconcilable antagonism to that vigorous enemy of the highest life of mankind, the Catholic Church." ("Darwiniana," p. 147.) Is this then the animus behind it all? Is this the intangible motive?

No religious fanaticism has ever equaled the zeal with which this new dogma was propagated in the schools and among the people. Yet it would seem impossible for men of learning and science, responsible for this deception of the masses, not to have known that they were dealing with a theory and not a certainty; that in no important step of the entire process of deduction could they claim more than the merest probability at the utmost; that in countless instances even this was wanting entirely, and that the statements made were the plainest assumptions with no other purpose than to sustain the impossible dogma of materialistic evolution, which seeks to account for the world without the intervention of God; and that, finally, there were thousands of unbridged chasms, many of them, on the evidence of science itself, forever unbridgeable. To refer to but a single instance we may mention the evolution of life from inorganic matter, since spontaneous generation has been entirely discarded by all progressive scientific research.

It is impossible to see then how a sincere investigation of the scientific evidence before them could have led men to any other conclusion than that expressed in the famous words of Lord Kelvin, quoted in the *London Times*: "I cannot say that with regard to the origin of life science neither affirms nor denies creative power. Science positively affirms creative power, which she compels us to accept as an article of belief." There is no other way in which the origin of life can ever be explained. "If we assume at all that living creatures were once formed out of inorganic matter," says Reinke, "then, so far as I can see, the theory of creation is the only one which satisfies the demands of logic and causality, and so satisfies the demands of reasonable scientific research." ("*Einleitung in die theoretische Biologie*," p. 559.) There is clearly no theological bias in these lines. From Sir Isaac Newton to the present day a long list of the most famous scientists—French, English, Italian, German, American, or of whatever nationality we please to mention—might here be enumerated, who with Sir William Steward proclaim that "all knowledge must lead up to one great result—that of an intelligent recognition of the Creator through His works."

Why then this dishonesty in classroom and textbook? Why this presentation of materialistic evolution as an established and unquestionable fact, when it was never even

a credible theory, in the sense that it was never based upon sufficient evidence to make of it a scientific possibility? Why the open regret expressed by certain noted scientists, that after all evolution has not disproved the existence of God? Is materialistic evolution merely a symptom of the disease, common enough in scientific circles, which has quite correctly been diagnosed as *theophobia*: a fear of God, that is neither a gift of the Holy Ghost nor yet the beginning of wisdom. It would certainly seem so. Evolution is acknowledged to have been a failure because it has not accomplished the one thing it was intended to accomplish, not indeed by Darwin, but by his lesser followers, the men who like Haeckel, sought to convert "Darwinism" into a scientific engine for the destruction of belief in God, with the one horrible result of a perverted morality that led to a war the most brutal in history.

Peace Potpourri in Paris

JOHN B. KENNEDY

THE world, its eyes focused on Paris, is having an object lesson in just how many cooks it takes to spoil a broth. The broth is the exceedingly well-known dish of international relations, bubbling and foaming and threatening to scorch the fingers of those impatient to taste it. In fact, it is so baffling a concoction that we, the Toms, Dicks and Harrys, who are to be its ultimate consumers, will be prejudiced rather against than for the dish, if we pry into it too much before it is finally presented to us.

Those of us who were in Paris when the first influx of practical pacifists commenced, felt instantly that some great evangel was upon us. We saw the evangelists, hordes of them, clamoring for space at the hotels, that is, those of them who were not accommodated in the lordly Crillon. We witnessed their gesticulations at static taxi-drivers, and knew that, despite their loudness and labors, all Paris was convinced of their importance.

And who are they? Nobody can answer positively. We who have seen them can only report that they are persons of different sex, different age, different voice; but all concerned in gathering news about everything, in taking yards of notes and pounding feverishly upon typewriters anywhere they may find them, in talking vaguely of wild political secrets, and in intimating that they possess some veiled authority to set the earth back on the orbit from which it madly strayed for four weary years.

Being a humble cog in a great war-wheel, the writer never ventured into personal contact with these rushing personages who have, somehow or other, prevailed upon somebody or other to grant them passports and provide them with transportation to the theater of peace. Only once, while patiently waiting at the Crillon, the headquarters of what the real newspapermen irreverently term, "our own peace outfit," did I come close upon one of these distinguished pilgrims. As I had rather pressing business with a man who is considered essential to the present diplomatic force of the United States, I presented myself at the Crillon and was closely inspected by a spruce youth who paid particular attention to the buttons on my uniform. He consulted a weary gentleman with grey hair and a languorous expression of difficulty to understand how some of us were ever permitted to bother him. They waved me to a sedan. The vestibule was extremely crowded. The sedan already sustained two ladies taking notes, so I forced myself into a corner. Then a ponderous personage entered, swaggered past the spruce youth, browbeat the weary gentleman and achieved the freedom of the entire

crowd, although his stomach was much larger than mine. I was curious enough to inquire concerning him and learned that he was interested in securing moving-pictures; that he bore letters on taxpayers' stationery from two Senators and three or four Congressmen and that he was never known to have said "thank you" to anybody on any occasion. I admire that "heavy-weight." Some day, if he does not attempt to get a long-distance telephone call in London, he will realize how very necessary he is in a world of sorrows.

There are many like him, all necessary, and chiefly female. They are, I think, running wild all over France. They fill every comfortable place and offer the chief explanation why all other places are uncomfortable. They are also the principal cause why the French Government continues to insist on bread-tickets. Where they succeed in securing personal transportation, major generals of the army, grizzled veterans who know something about how the war was won and how the peace should be settled, fail. More than one high army officer has been stamping about his headquarters, cursing the prospect of a long walk through the rain-ridden streets, while some debonair follower of the peace camp serenely drove through the boulevards in a khakied limousine, calling upon nobody in particular and transacting no business of consequence to the nation paying for the gasoline.

The female of the species is especially astounding. She, as a rule, wears her hair intellectually short and steps in and out of fashionable restaurants with large, comprehensive strides. She speaks rapidly, introducing the President's name without any such unintimate prefix as "mister." Colonel House, too, becomes devoid of rank when she uses his name, and poor, abused Mr. Creel will never know how many strangers carelessly refer to him by what was originally intended to be his Christian name. The emphatic patriotism of the lady challenges a query. She speaks visionarily of an Anglo-Saxon union as the only possible solution of world entanglements. The Jugo-Slavs, to her, are persons whose necks need filing, and as for the Bolsheviki, they are a sort of vulgar demon-race inhabiting a large and malodorous hades known as Russia. She refuses to think of them without referring to her *quelque-fleured* kerchief.

I do not think the French people are much impressed with the American tribe of peace supernumeraries who have gone to look over the situation. Our soldiers they frankly admire and frankly criticize. Our ordinary, work-a-day newspapermen they have learned to detest, politely, however. But these peace parasites are something new, a species they cannot comprehend.

Other nations have their best native comedy amply presented in Paris. There is King Peter of Montenegro, who has been known to dash out of his hotel, jeweled sword in hand, and defy the Boche aircraft while his Chancellor followed nervously behind, conscious of the fact that an astute pawnbroker operated an ever-open establishment next door and that the jeweled sword did not, in the last analysis, belong to his Majesty. Several anonymous Premiers of as yet unestablished governments will also present you with their calling cards on the slightest provocation, their secretaries, who live upon anything but wages, intimating that interviewers will not be rudely rebuffed. The British have an entire corps of busy-bodies ordering waiters hither and yon, while behind non-fluttering palms, swarthy Italian noblemen of no definite employment can be seen whispering to each other the latest tidings from the first antechamber on the third floor of the Quirinal.

It is most refreshing for a common fellow who has read through the switchback, daily narratives of the war for democracy, to take stock of this whirlwind attending the first open season of democratic diplomacy. It is consoling to know that, whatever Mr. Wilson's experience with subtle minds may be, he has some definite knowledge of exactly what he wants; while it is to be feared, or perhaps hoped, that the subtle minds will

be so engrossed in their subtleties that they will ultimately have to be satisfied with what they get.

But no matter what clever deductions one makes from the present state of affairs in Paris—and the deductions, in the long run, will be dull and disturbing rather than clever—the presence of scores of mimetic plenipotentiaries must be explained, else the French people may come to believe that under the guise of military intervention we are about to swamp them with civilian invasion. Our army they welcomed; our war-relief workers they welcomed; our newspapermen they admitted with uncertain shrugs but tolerable courtesy. These other fauna, however, they did not prevent from entering France, and most assuredly they will not prevent them from leaving. For where food prices are high it is difficult—at least to the Gallic intelligence, which is normally acute—to understand why these voluble immigrants should remain where, by all the laws and devious circumstances of international comity, national exigence and general human welfare, they are not wanted.

My guess is that they are enjoying themselves immensely, although now that the income tax reaches down to us of lesser means, the fact of their enjoyment is not a matter for philanthropic hurrahs. We can, however, be thankful that Peace is so wraithful and tenuous a lady that she can slip into Paris and remain there without discommoding them; otherwise our draft-boards might yet have work ahead.

The Mantuan Land of Virgil

JOSEPH F. WICKHAM, M.A.

A STILLY lake shadowing in the wind; a fleet of fishing boats with flapping sails all crimson; tall campanili emulous of the clouds; and houses, silver lines of houses telling their tale of human habitation; so does Mantua say *Ave*. Is it a fair voice she speaks, is it soft and low and feminine? Of a truth, yes, but most like the word of a forlorn maiden grieving a well-loved friend. For such Mantua is, alone in the silence of her lagoons, thinking of her youth-time, and finding in her memories a sadness well-nigh glad.

Perhaps it was down in Naples at Virgil's tomb that you first resolved to come to Mantua, perhaps the "*Mantua me genuit*" has been for years stealing into your thoughts at intervals, like a favored refrain of some once-heard song. But it is Virgil who has beckoned you hither to see with your own eyes the mother of the singer of Troy and Rome. And now that you are here, you are full of memories of the old hexameters, and their perfect rhythmic flow. All the glowing magnificence of the deeds of Anchises' son, all the delicate beauty of idyllic country life, all the haunting loveliness of many a Roman farm—how oddly the mind recalls line after line of the Latin verse now buried within the unvisited pages of a dun-covered book at home. Then will you think of Virgil's supremacy in the Middle Ages, when kinship with Isaias was scarce denied him, for he, too, hailed, or seemed to hail, the advent of the Saviour. And you will remember him as Dante's companion when the great Florentine journeyed through a visioned hell and purgatory, "*Lo mio maestro e il mio autore*" the lover of Beatrice sang him. Your musings will be sweet, and they will be refreshing, all savoring of the fragrance of mellow afternoons of yore. You will be glad that the Orpheus of imperial Rome still woos with the blended harmonies he struck 1800 years ago; you will find an unwonted delight in the thought that Virgil, the poet of Augustan patriotism, has called you also to Mantua, another recruit in the multiplying legions that follow the song.

But other things await the visitor to Mantua beside these Virgilian reminiscences. If Virgil it was that led you here, it is the House of Gonzaga that will keep you for a while. Its members hold no mean place in history; patrons of letters, builders of

palaces, cardinals, and conquerors, they have written their names indelibly on the annals of Italy. And you can pay the artistic family no courtlier compliment than to go at once to the Piazza dell' Erbe, where stands the church of Sant' Andrea, the chief edifice of worship in Mantua. The history of the church carries you back to the year 804, when a little oratory was built on the site in memory of Saint Andrew. In 1046 Reatrice of Canossa built a beautiful church here in honor of the birth of her daughter Matilda. This church passed through assault and fire and restoration. Finally in 1472 Ludovico Gonzaga invited Leon Battista Alberti, the Florentine architect, to erect a new church. Twenty-two years later the nave was completed. After a century of idleness the transept and the choir were added in 1597 by Viani. In 1697 Viani's work was vaulted, and in 1732 the dome began to take shape in the hands of Juvara. In 1787 the church was done, the campanile of 1413 having waited over three and one-half centuries for the full growth for which its bells seemed every day calling.

On the east side of the Piazza di Santi Pietro e Paolo, opposite the Gothic pinnacles of the Palazzo Cadenazzi and the Palazzo Castiglioni, both of the thirteenth century, rise the massive walls of the Palazzo Ducale, or Reggia. Guido Buonacolsi began this palace in 1302, and the Gonzaga family continued the work. Giulio Romano was the most important of the decorators who filled this palace with glory and splendor in the days of the prime of Mantua's leading house. You can even now get an idea of what it was by a visit to the apartments of Isabella d'Este, the beautiful wife of Giovanni Francesco III. Perhaps it is rather of her than of the Renaissance decoration you will be thinking as you pass through the halls. For she was assuredly a wonderfully gifted woman, this lady of Ferrara. "*La prima donna del Mondo*," who sailed one day in regal state up the Po to Mantua to wed the Gonzaga. You would like now to handle those rare classics of Aldo's printing, to look upon the gems and lutes, to admire the vases and sculptures, to view the pictures by Titian and Bellini and Perugino and Mantegna and Correggio and Lorenzo Costa and so very many others; for Isabella was a connoisseur of exquisite ability, and she had a vast collection once upon a time. But you would have to visit more than one museum in Europe to find them now, for when the German soldiers sacked Mantua in 1630, they did not forget the treasures of this palace. The echoes of footsteps wake many thoughts today in the Palazzo Ducale, thoughts about a Napoleon, or a Eugene Beauharnais, but it is to Isabella d'Este that you dedicate your dearest dreams, and it is the aroma of her memory that you breathe in your lingering progress through the halls.

Many comers to Mantua will be interested in journeying three miles or more along the acacia-shadowed road beyond the city to the beautiful brick and terra-cotta church of Santa Maria delle Grazie. This is a votive church which Francesco Gonzaga and the Mantuan people dedicated to the Blessed Virgin in 1399, in thanksgiving for the departure of the plague. The church is filled with offerings from pilgrims who have received favors for their faith. Of particular note are the tombs of the Gonzaga family and that of the author of "*Il Cortegiano*," Baldassare Castiglioni, with an epitaph by Bembo.

Now you are almost ready to leave Mantua; to leave her to her silent piazze and quiet streets and the lonely waters of her circling lakes. She is yet the same city of dreamy stillness you first found her, isled with her towers and pinnacles in the river and marsh. But you have seen her, as well, when the sun gleamed from a sky of unscathed blue, and the lakes shone, and the old piazza glowed in beauty, and every palace was alight with brilliance, when the buoyant, fiery energy of Middle Ages and Renaissance seemed eager again to leap into life. You will try to remember her so.

You are going back to Verona now, at the close of a joyful

day. In a moment the long Argine Molino bridge will take you over the water; you will catch twilight glimpses of a thousand whispering reeds shaking their heads in the damp moss; a score of dusky little cities will run to meet you, the faithful embassies of the way; then by and by the stars will bejewel the Lombardy sky, just as you reach Verona, perhaps; and you will be joyful of the grandeur above, and as you pass through the streets you will remember that the same night of beauty that watches over you here has its fair eyes beaming above the peaceful lanes of Mantua.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words

Catholic Students in Catholic Colleges

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Father Donnelly has asked me to look up the number of college students in Mt. St. Mary's College, so that I may learn how many boys from Baltimore are attending that institution. I find on consulting the catalogue for 1913-1914, the only one available, that only seven Baltimoreans attended the college during that scholastic year. Surely the presence of these seven young men at Mt. St. Mary's will not explain the low numbers at Loyola College, Baltimore, forty miles away.

Father Donnelly is hardly fair in contrasting the number of day scholars at Holy Cross during the present scholastic year, when so many of our Catholic boys are still serving the United States, with the number of students in the Catholic colleges of Philadelphia in 1916, before our Catholic boys so willingly exchanged their books for engines of war. At present St. Joseph's College can boast thirty-five students in the college department, while the number at La Salle is not much larger. Villanova is not within the city limits and the majority of its college students are recruited outside of Philadelphia. To quote the number of students in the preparatory department of St. Charles' Seminary as college students is also open to objection, as this number includes high-school students. Nor should Father Donnelly fail to mention the Catholic students from Worcester attending Assumption College. Figures may be sent to prove any view, but the following statistics based upon the census report of 1910 go to prove my contention that an education is more highly valued in Massachusetts than elsewhere. In 1910 the population of Massachusetts was 3,693,310; of Pennsylvania, 7,665,111; of New York 9,113,614; of Maryland 1,295,346. In 1916 Massachusetts had 42,640 male students in her public and private high schools; Pennsylvania had 56,959; New York 81,324, and Maryland 6,603. If these figures mean anything they mean that in Maryland, Pennsylvania and New York there is not the same desire for higher education that there is in the Bay State.

Oella, Maryland.

F. X. M.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

After reading Father Donnelly's letter in AMERICA for January 18 on Catholic attendance at Catholic colleges, I went to the "Catholic Directory" to investigate the conditions in some dioceses. I was disappointed in finding that the figures given were worthless so far as telling us how many Catholics are in Catholic colleges.

For instance, consider the statistics for the Baltimore diocese. We are told in the summary that there are three universities, though in the more extended notice only Georgetown and the Catholic University are mentioned. Both these universities have collegiate departments, that is to say, undergraduate students other than in the professions of law or medicine. But it is difficult to tell whether their college students are included in the 1,775 said to be in eleven colleges and academies for boys. If the college students are included, are the university students

also in these 1,775, since they are not mentioned separately? How many of this number are below freshman, and are they all Catholics?

Then I turned to the Texas dioceses with which I happened to be more familiar. In Galveston we are credited with one university and one college. As a matter of fact, I think that we have neither a university nor a college. If I am not mistaken, neither institution has any classes above high school. I do not mean that they claim to have college classes, and unkind critics say that they are not more than equivalent to a good high school, but that they themselves admit that they have no such classes.

In San Antonio the "Directory" tells us that there are five colleges for boys with 736 students. So far is this from the truth that there are only two institutions having any college classes at all, and these have only freshman and sophomore with a combined attendance of about twenty-five.

I do not know who is to blame for the defectiveness of the statistics. But I think that we may reasonably expect this "Directory" to tell us the number of colleges in a strict sense, the number of high schools, and the number of Catholic students of each sex in the colleges and in the high schools. Furthermore, if fifty per cent of the students in a Catholic institution are not Catholics, they should not be returned as Catholics. Yet as matters now stand we cannot be sure that the figures in the "Directory" cover only Catholic attendance.

And I think that it would be possible for each diocese to hand in the number of Catholic students attending non-Catholic colleges and high schools. We ought to know this, too. Many such institutions keep a record of the church affiliation of students. Where they do not, a priest detailed for this work by the Bishop could probably secure the exact number.

May I suggest through your columns, therefore, that some educational experts, a committee of the Catholic Educational Association, for instance, revise the blanks sent out by the "Catholic Directory" and put them into such shape that the figures returned by the various dioceses will have some value for students. Until we get at the facts we are largely talking at random.

Austin, Texas.

J. E. R.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Bellarmino said of Calvin, "*peccavit per transennam*," and we may say the same, *salva reverentia*, of Father Donnelly, S.J., and of his insistence upon the point of numbers at Catholic colleges. He has changed the "degree of certitude" with which he presented his first calculations; for F. X. M. punctured them, and now Father Donnelly employs the cautionary "I think." I wish merely to object to his statement that "Holy Cross and Boston College have large numbers, because they are practically without competition in New England." Ye shades of the shadowy President Emeritus Eliot of Harvard, who only a few years ago boasted that he had more Catholic boys at his composite place than either Boston College or Holy Cross. And they were boys mainly from Boston itself, scions of the *nouveaux riches*, who had been advanced in life by the more sterling Catholics of the Hub.

No competition! Only ten years ago, a senior at Boston College, who is now a prosperous civil engineer on the Pacific Coast, narrated in his "May-talk" before the class that he, with three other boys, leaving the Boston Latin School, went for advice about selecting a college; and the advisor, a priest, told them to go to Harvard, "for the greater social distinction" of that place. Three of them went, and may I add, as the senior did publicly, though it be shocking, the three at that time had ceased to be practical Catholics. Was not Harvard, with its "greater social distinction," a competitor? And does Father Donnelly know, as I do, in this vicinity of Yale, how tremendous a competitor is

Yale for Holy Cross patronage? Waterbury, only a few miles distant from New Haven, sends a big list every year to Holy Cross; a few go from New Haven; but a larger number, even boys whose parents can afford to send them to Holy Cross, are not of the households of real Catholics, and go to the "competitor." Dartmouth, Brown, Williams and Amherst have many boys who ought to be at Holy Cross, at Notre Dame, at Fordham or Georgetown; and they would be there, most of them, if they had the type of home which cultivates the intellectual and moral atmosphere of our colleges. Then, too, there are five Catholic colleges in New England, and may they, too, prosper and glory in their deserved numbers, which are competitors of Holy Cross and Boston.

Ansonia, Conn.

F. J. R., '89.

The Smith Bill

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the issue of AMERICA for February 8 there was an editorial about the Smith Educational bill and an article on "The First Secretary of Education." This bill, apparently, is another effort of the wolves in sheep's clothing to destroy Catholic education. You suggest that a personal letter should be written to our Congressmen. How much better would be a nation-wide protest signed by millions of Catholics that could be presented at Washington by some prominent Catholic? Could not this work be entrusted to the Knights of Columbus, or to the students of our Catholic colleges, or to the heads of the dioceses throughout the country? Printed petitions could easily be obtained and circulated. Witness the unified action of the Jews in regard to a bill that was detrimental to their interests. Are Catholics to be indifferent to the Smith bill? Let us send to Washington a protest that will echo throughout the country. The trouble is with us Catholics that just because we belong to a universal Church which is of Divine origin, we seem to think there is little need of promoting such very human organized effort as is the foregoing in order to defend the Church.

Boston.

S. B. F.

Inaccurate and Misleading Reports

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The impression prevails in certain quarters that the French Government is charging the American Expeditionary Forces for what has been described as "trench rent," and for damages done to property in actual warfare in the firing zone. The impression is both inaccurate and misleading. There is no such thing as "trench rent." Damages done to private property in the rear of the operating forces have always been made good to owners of the property damaged by the Government responsible. This applies equally to the American and the French in the regions where cantonments and maneuvers are likely to harm fields, crops, barns, houses and the like. But, of course, this does not apply to the firing zone.

The French Government has made it a point to extend to the American army the most friendly hospitality, and it has been its policy to see that in no place should American troops be treated in a manner differing from the way French troops are dealt with. Likewise, the French Government has, free of charge, put public buildings, hospitals and schools, belonging to it, at the disposal of the Allies. The same policy holds good at the front; French and American units relieve each other in identical conditions. War material has been used in common. Whenever a unit goes into a sector, an inventory of the existing supplies is filed, the procedure adhered to in that regard being identical, whether the relief takes place between American and French troops or between French troops alone. In a like manner, in billets in back areas, the rates of the requisitions paid by American units are exactly the same as those paid by the French

Government. Finally, in respect to damage caused to private property by American troops the regulations of the bill of April 18, 1918, prevail, which provide that such claims as may arise are admitted only so far as they comply with the French laws on that question.

Captain André Tardieu, head of the General Commission for Franco-American War Matters, speaking to the Associated Press on December 31, relative to certain extraordinary rumors which had been in circulation in Paris, denied officially that the American army had been requested to pay rent for the trenches it occupied at the front or for territory occupied militarily behind the front:

Numerous reports of French, as well as American and British origin, have revealed to us that German propaganda is not dead and the work of its organization is making itself felt. One indication, among many others, is found in the persistence of this absurd rumor. It is almost inconceivable, and I would not take the pains to deny it, if I were not informed that it is still in circulation today. It has been said that when American troops took up a new sector on our front they had to pay rent for it to the French Government, and that when American troops captured ground from the enemy in battle they had to pay rent for the reconquered territory. I deny it officially in the most categorical fashion.

In the rear zone all questions of indemnity to private parties are treated on the same basis by the French and Allied armies. The regulation of these questions is vested with the American staff bureau at Tours. All claims are considered under the provisions of the American law of April 18, 1918. The American staff is sole judge of all claims, and no recourse has been opened to claimants up to this time for appeal from its decision.

This official statement should be a sufficient warning to Americans against giving credence to reports which are not only false, but are aimed at destroying the good feeling between France and the United States.

New York.

M. A. J.

Blasco Ibanez, the Zola of Spain

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Clever advertising has sold many a novel and enriched its author. Foreign novels and foreign authors are now popular in the United States and enterprising publishers must seek new names and new novels to meet the demand. The latest subject of clever advertising is Vicente Blasco Ibañez, the Zola of Spain. As the writer of this letter lived for some years in the same part of Spain as Blasco Ibañez, and is familiar with his novels, and the Spanish estimate of his work, it may be well to permit a word of warning to the readers of AMERICA.

Many Catholics have read "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse," and, in fact, we have noticed that several Catholic papers have advertised the novel. At its best, it must be classed as a godless book and somewhat tiresome, even despite the author's power of massing data and visualizing scenes. It does appeal to those eager to get a clever and clear analysis and insight of German war-aims, as viewed by a Spaniard. But like all the novels of Blasco Ibañez, it soon wearies the reader, for there is no real plot, no pathos, no humor. We find only a series of disconnected incidents, with characters that indulge in speeches which are essays conveying the novelist's own views. But this is not our point. Many Catholics have read "The Four Horsemen," but few know that this work in English is only the first step of the attempt to introduce into the United States the other more tiresome and objectionable novels of this renegade, who writes with the one purpose of destroying every vestige of religious belief in God and the hereafter.

I call Vicente Blasco Ibañez the Zola of Spain, but I must add an apology to the immoral French writer. Zola has some humor and pathos; Blasco Ibañez has neither. The Spaniard descends to the methods of the yellowest journal of Spain, *El Pais*, and

represents the clergy as grossly ignorant, avaricious and immoral. He portrays the Church as fearful of science. History, geology and astronomy cause its poor, ignorant bishops and priests to quake with fear for their future living. The people must be kept ever in ignorance. Take all these ideas and put them in the mouths of puppets, and, then, add to them a Spanish newspaper reporter's facility of description in a book of disconnected dramatic incidents and you have the novels of Vicente Blasco Ibañez at their best.

He will never be popular in the United States among the educated. He will fail to attract here as he failed in Spain, because he is a tiresome writer, too bunglingly vulgar in his slanders of religion and its ministers. He lacks the charm, the touches of beauty which distinguish the novels of Fernán Caballero and Padre Luis Coloma. His style has none of the grace of that greatest of Spanish writers since the Golden Age of Spain, the late Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo. But Vicente Blasco Ibañez has the satanic cunning to lay his scenes in the most Catholic environment in order to discredit religion and misrepresent its ministers. He attacks the Catholic Church because it is the strongest, but he hates every Church that honors God.

New York.

CHARLES J. MULLALY, S.J.

Dr. Eliot's Change of Views

To the Editor of AMERICA:

As I finished reading Father Donnelly's well-timed article, "The First Secretary of Education," in the issue of AMERICA for February 8, I was led to take up the lecture itself of Dr. Charles W. Eliot, with which Father Donnelly had dealt so convincingly. For some reason, not fully accounted for, I had come to look upon Dr. Eliot as a sort of Peri out of Paradise, ever since his resignation from the presidency of Harvard. Hence his lecture, printed in the *New York Times*, had been lying on my desk for several months, unread. I had not gone much beyond the opening lines, however, when the first sentence to arrest my attention was Dr. Eliot's statement that

Although the existing illiteracy [7.7 per cent in the population] and its consequences [?] were brought to the attention of the American people by the war, the whole people [this is rather a large circle of acquaintance for one man even with Dr. Eliot's years] at once saw that the public interest in the prevention of illiteracy was not all confined to war times.

At this point Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler's address on "Liberal Learning as Leavened by War," delivered six days later than Dr. Eliot's lecture, recurred to my mind. Even at the time of reading it I had been deeply impressed with the gratifying prospect it presented of a broad and thoroughly sane educational reform. But in the light of Dr. Eliot's views, many of Dr. Butler's statements seemed to acquire a new and fuller meaning, and I began to wonder whether there may not have been a very special point in his remark:

We ought now, that the boasting Teutonic structure lies in the dust, to be spared, at least for a time, the vexing spectacle of men in places of authority in education and in letters who spend their time standing in front of the convex mirror of egoism thinking that what they see reflected in it is a real world and their own exact relation to it.

The concluding paragraphs of Dr. Eliot's lecture, however, in which he deals with the question of religious instruction, struck me as particularly significant of the danger to which Father Donnelly does little more than allude in his comments on "The Original Bolshevik." Dr. Eliot says:

Some line officer who has been intimate with his men . . . or some chaplain who has shared with the privates their hardships and their dangers . . . ought to prepare a manual of the religion of the thinking soldier in this war for the freedom and security of mankind. It would contain no dogma, creed or ritual and no church history; but it would

set forth the fundamental religious ideas which ought to be conveyed in the schools to every American child and adolescent in the schools of the future. Such teaching would counteract materialism, promote reverence for God and human nature, strengthen the foundations of a just and peace-loving democracy.

Now, if Dr. Eliot will kindly not take it amiss, I must plainly confess that the image suggested to my mind by this, his latest display of interest in "the religion of the future," was that of Robespierre as painted by the vigorous pen of Thomas Carlyle:

Catholicism being burned out and reason-worship guillotined, was there not need of one [a religion]? Incorruptible Robespierre, not unlike the ancients, as legislator of a free people will now also be priest and prophet. . . . He is president of the Convention; he has made the Convention decree, so they name it, *décréter* the "Existence of the Supreme Being" and likewise "*ce principe consolateur* of the immortality of the soul." These consolatory principles, of rational republican religion, are getting decreed; and here, on this blessed Decadi by help of Heaven and painter David, is to be our first act of worship.

The rest, too long for quotation, is well worth reading ("The French Revolution," pt. 3, b. 6, ch. 4) and will be found not altogether inappropriate.

But waiving all this aside, the point I would like to make, which was not touched on by Father Donnelly, is: why did Dr. Eliot, in his enumeration of the defects of American education as revealed by the war, make no mention of university professors; and how comes it that his opinion with regard to the subsidizing of education by the Federal Government has changed so radically in recent years from what it was formerly? Back in 1874 he declared himself to be emphatically opposed to the very measures he is now advocating, and the following reasons which he then gave are assuredly as valid now as they ever were. I have not been able to lay my hands on the speech itself, which Dr. Eliot delivered before the National Education Association, but I shall not, I hope, be doing an injustice to his original meaning if I render it in my own words from a French translation by Claudio Jannet:

The only safeguards of the liberty of the people are national habits and the customs and character developed in time by the long continued practice of self-government. We deceive ourselves if we entertain the belief that primary or university education is a guarantee of republican institutions. The people in a republic should be enlightened and intelligent; but it by no means follows that, because a people is enlightened and intelligent, it will, therefore and perforce, constitute a republic. I may be thought to be conjuring up imaginary dangers; but it is very necessary that we, the educators of the country, should keep ever in mind the maxim: *Principiis obsta*. Let us therefore as Americans hold fast to our own national system, the old system of Massachusetts, which is utterly opposed to such military and despotic organization of public instruction as that which prevails in Prussia. (cf. "*Les Etats-Unis Contemporains*," vol. 2. ch. 20, "*L'Ecole et l'Etat*").

How are we to account for Dr. Eliot's present complete *volte face*? Well, as Father Donnelly justly remarks, he is "a shrewd observer." So was the Peri, and Robespierre, we know, for all his humanitarianism, was nothing more than an intellectual rag-picker. The question is: whither has Dr. Eliot been directing his powers of observation? It would appear that "we the people of the United States," who still believe in "the laws of nature and nature's God," who all along have been living in the conviction that the Constitution was established to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," have not been sufficiently aware of what has been taking place in our universities. And lest I be thought to be conjuring up imaginary dangers I quote the following open confession taken from the pages of Prof. C. Edward Merriam's "History of American Political Theories" (1918):

In recent years the influence of German political scientists has been most pronounced. This influence began with the

work of [the German scientist] Francis Lieber as an instructor in American schools and an investigator in the field of political science. In the movement toward the study of politics during the last few decades, the leaders almost without exception, have been men trained in German schools, familiar with German methods; and profoundly influenced by German ideas. The works of such publicists as Gneist, Stein, Thering, Bluntschli, Jellinek and Holzendorff are clearly evident in the method and thought of present-day political scientists. So far as particular doctrines are concerned, the influence of the German school is most obvious in relation to the contract theory of the origin of the State and the idea of the function of the State.

According to these Germanizers:

Liberty is not a natural right which belongs to every human being without regard to the State or society under which he lives. On the contrary, it is logically true and may be historically demonstrated that the State is the source of individual liberty.

In conclusion it is worth noting that, as Prof. Merriam points out:

The assertion is made that in the future the control of society will be secured largely through the instrumentality of education, the best method of insurance against the spirit of disobedience in the individual.

Dr. Eliot's notions about vocational training and the measures he proposes for applying them certainly look very suspicious.

Woodstock, Md.

M. F. X. M.

A Perpetual Service Flag

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Your editorial "A Perpetual Service Flag" in AMERICA for February 8, beyond its direct appeal indirectly suggests many excellent means of keeping those stars shining. One practical means occurs to me, namely, a nation-wide annual Holy Communion day for our ex-soldiers. Such a reunion of Catholic officers, privates and even of all men subject to the draft, in every parish in every diocese of the United States, receiving Holy Communion in their parish church or in their cathedral on a national holiday designated by each bishop for his diocese, or better still, by our Hierarchy for all dioceses, would through many coming years be a fitting public profession of the United States' devotion to God and of the Church's loyalty to the United States.

May 30, July 4, November 11 will find the men engaged in civic parades; but Columbus Day, Thanksgiving Day or any Sunday designated by our Bishops will be welcomed by our men as their opportunity for professing by parade and religious service their gratitude to and their pride in their Church and their country. Organization of these men into various commemorative associations will soon begin, in fact has begun. Before they are affiliated with too many organizations, let us have some kind of definite annual Catholic function to which these men will feel themselves obligated primarily. An annual Catholic function commemorative of our unequalled loyalty to our country's call will help to keep those stars shining.

Omaha.

JAMES P. DWYER.

The Rev. Stiggins and "Bitters"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I not, in order to make safe the records of how the elect "got their drinks in the '60s," suggest that there are some errors of fact in the letter from S. H. Horgan, printed in AMERICA for February 22? Demas Barnes never was Mayor of Brooklyn; neither did he manufacture "Hostetter's Bitters." His special brew was labeled "Plantation Bitters." He was the owner and publisher of the Brooklyn *Argus*, later consolidated with the *Standard Union*. And wasn't *Schiedam Schnapps* gin, not rum? Brooklyn.

H. F.

A M E R I C A

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1919

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Mass a Crime, and Priests Criminals

THE Federal Prohibition Amendment makes no explicit exception of wine to be used in the Holy Sacrifice. Under the Reed Amendment and the Webb-Kenyon law, the Federal Government will protect the individual States in whatever Prohibition legislation they may enact. These are two points of prime importance in reference to the Holy Sacrifice. The third point is this: a number of active fanatics see in the Federal Amendment, and in such State laws as may be passed under the "concurrent jurisdiction" proviso, the chance of centuries to put an end, as they fondly imagine, to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

It is difficult to discuss mathematics with one who is firmly persuaded that the sum of two plus two is five, but the position of the fanatics is not the legal absurdity it may at first be thought. The so-called "freedom of worship" Amendment to the Federal Constitution means precisely what it says. It lays a restriction upon Congress, not upon the States. The States may do as they choose touching the suppression of one religion or the establishment of another, being bound in this respect only by the tenor of their own laws and constitutions. Until 1831, Massachusetts had what was in effect a State Church, and not until long after the Civil War, was a Catholic eligible as Governor of New Hampshire. Even now, that State makes provision for public teachers of "the Protestant religion." Further, whatever the "concurrent jurisdiction" proviso may imply, it certainly does not confer upon the respective States the power to nullify the Amendment, by permitting within their own boundaries, the manufacture and open vending of alcoholic liquors. On the other hand, however, read in connection with existing Federal legislation on the same subject, it by no means forbids the States to prohibit the use of alcoholic liquors for all purposes whatever. In other words, while the States may not allow what the Amendment forbids, they may, if they choose, forbid what the Amendment, directly, or by possible implication, allows.

Finally, when it is recalled that religious belief cannot be offered as justification for an act in violation of law, no doubt remains that even now, but certainly after January, 1920, any State, dominated by anti-Catholic fanatics, can make the use of wine in the Holy Sacrifice a crime, and every offending priest a criminal.

The trend of anti-Catholic bigotry can usually be first discerned in Florida, and the present case forms no exception. Speaking at a meeting of the Miami Ministerial Association on February 10, Dr. J. M. Gross vigorously protested against any exception in the proposed State law "of wine for church purposes," and in this position was ably seconded by his Christian brother, the Rev. Ira E. Adams. "Prohibition in the church," said this remarkable divine, "is as necessary as Prohibition in the street." But Florida is not the only place where bigots dwell, nor are all fanatics Protestants or Atheists. Catholics who care nothing for the Holy Sacrifice, provided that legal Prohibition be established, are, happily, few and, in truth, not Catholics at all. They may ponder with profit perhaps, but only perhaps, the fact that at this present moment the railroads are refusing shipments to "dry towns" within the boundaries of a great Eastern State of wine intended for the Holy Sacrifice. For those who carry this wine and those who receive it are alike, by the Prohibition "laws" of these communities, criminals.

Senator Lodge and Ireland

A YOUNG man is not always wrong. When he opens his mouth to discourse, he does not, by a kind of compulsion, utter an absurdity or a truism. The thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts, and sometimes they are exceedingly valuable. Thus, for instance, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, said very well, nearly a quarter of a century ago:

We sympathize instinctively . . . with men who are struggling *anywhere for freedom and the right to govern themselves*. In certain quarters today, it is the fashion to sneer at this American sentiment, and to ask why we should sympathize with the Irish, or waste thought on them. . . . When the modern friends of England in the United States jeeringly ask why we should trouble ourselves about the Irish . . . and go so far afield with our sympathies, they fail to remember the history of their own country. . . . *Sympathy for men fighting for freedom anywhere is distinctively American*, and when from fear or greed or from absorption in merely material things we despise and abandon it, we shall not only deny our history and our birth-right, but our faith in our own Republic and all we most cherish will fade and grow dim. (Italics inserted.)

Noble words are these. True, the Senator was not speaking for Ireland. He was pleading the cause of Cuba against Spain. But the change of words makes no difference whatever. To sympathize with "men fighting for freedom anywhere," is, as Mr. Lodge justly observes, a distinctively American trait. We cannot now replace that sympathy by unfriendliness to Ireland, without disowning our whole history. With Ireland, we Americans have a peculiar bond of sympathy. Our own Govern-

ment is built on the foundation of political and religious liberty. Ireland has championed these principles as has no other nation on earth, and in their defense has poured out her blood for centuries.

Nor are her children in America recreant sons of this noble mother. The most recent order for the conferring of the Distinguished Service Cross contains seven names. The first four are Kelly, McLaughlin, Hanley and Gill. These are followed by Thomas, Harlin, and Roskoski. The modern defenders of liberty, "distinguished for extraordinary heroism," do not seem to be exclusively, or even largely, "Anglo-Saxon." But, however this may be, our sympathy with "men fighting for freedom anywhere" lacks the first element of sincerity if it excludes Ireland, whose sons have fought for freedom on the world's bloodiest fields of battle.

The Smith Bill and "Bolshevism"

THE New York newspapers are vastly excited over the spread of "Bolshevism" in the public schools. There is really no reason for all this pother, for the facts in question are nothing new. For at least five years, certain half-educated teachers have been permitted, reluctantly perhaps, but permitted, to imbue the minds of their young charges with principles thoroughly destructive of morality. At least one teacher was allowed to recommend to half-grown boys and girls a printed list of books on sex-perversion and other perversions, which the public library officials indignantly refused to supply to the schools. The timidity of the responsible officials in refusing to deal promptly with these shocking conditions, is not wholly inexcusable. They cannot insist upon any public school conforming to a definite creed in philosophy and morality, and they know it. The favored philosophy of the day recognizes no objective norm of morality, and no authority that can warn, guide, and condemn with finality. Only when vileness in theory has worked to its logical conclusion of vileness in word and outward deed, can they act.

Yet this is the system which the Smith bill proposes to foist upon the American people, to the practical exclusion of the school which teaches the child reverence for God, its fellows, rightful authority, and itself. No one can regard the vast majority of American public school teachers with any feeling but that of deep respect. At the same time, no one need have any hesitation in looking upon the public school system as "godless," for that, precisely, is what it is. No man ever put God out of his life without ending in the muck, and no system ever deliberately excluded Almighty God from the range of its considerations, without leading its followers to destruction. That the American public school has not worked out the full meed of evil, inherent in its fundamental principle of exclusion of all definite religious belief, is due mainly to the fact that very many of the teachers are far better than the system with which they are connected.

The only schools which can openly oppose "Bolshevism," Socialism, and any and all aberrations from religious creed and morals, are the parochial schools. They alone have a definite standard in faith and morality, which they do not fear to propose and to defend. They alone can protect the impressionable mind of the child from the destructive influence of evil men and evil principles, and give him a lasting motive which will make him a good citizen and a good Christian. These are the schools directly attacked by the Smith bill. The possibilities of that bill are well expressed in a letter received from a pastor in a Southern State:

The people of my parish are very poor, but they are most willing to make sacrifices for the Faith. At present, they are thinking about building a parochial school and bringing in the Sisters. This would mean a very heavy expense, and it would take us all of five years even to pay for the building. I am somewhat loath to undertake it because of this miserable Smith bill. If it should become a law, what could I do?

About the only thing this zealous pastor could do, humanly speaking, would be to close his little school, thus allowing the children to fall into the hands of teachers who, like some of their New York confreres, might not hesitate to propose, given the chance, descriptive courses in violence and sex-immorality. There is scarcely a feature of the Smith bill, as it affects constitutional principles, that is not objectionable. But to the extent that it proposes to subsidize schools, in which the teaching of immorality can go on until it engages the attention of the police, it is nothing less than an abomination.

A Courteous Anti-Saloon Agent

THERE was once a persuasion in this country that the making of laws was a peculiar function of the legislative branch of the government, State and Federal. In the kaleidoscopic change of circumstances which has overtaken us, that is one of many persuasions awaiting revision and correction. It now seems that the law and the law's enforcement, are to be entrusted to various bands of fanatics, notably, to the members of the "religio-political" Anti-Saloon League. An agent of this association, who for years harried the demon rum at a salary that ever kept the wolf at a safe distance from his door, has recently adopted the practice of issuing daily bulletins, outlining what he will and will not allow, when Prohibition comes into full swing in the State of New York. The situation is indeed serious, but neither patriotism nor common decency has any part in the problem. The politicians at Albany, "afraid of the labor vote," as one of them openly allows, are counting noses, to discover whether in their districts there are more workingmen who want their beer, than venerable and homeless dames who declare that an immortal soul is the price of a flagon of ale. But whatever happens, the Anti-Saloon League is ready to listen to the suggestions of the Governor of the State, with "the most respectful consideration." Incredible as it may seem, the league's salaried agent has issued a decree to that effect.

But he warns the Governor that he must not attempt to come into court, with an aura of hops and malt.

Any suggestions that you may make that are calculated better to carry out the spirit of the Amendment and which will not interfere with the efficient enforcement of the law, will receive most respectful consideration, and, so far as possible, will be incorporated to the extent of acceptance by the backers of the bill (i.e., The Anti-Saloon League).

But the Governor's hopes must not be unduly elated by this condescension of the League's salaried agent. It is a grace, a favor, that he extends, not a right. He, not the legislature, will write the bill. He, not the Governor, will look to its enforcement. The insolence of the suggestion is equaled only by its stupidity, but while citizens slept, insolence and stupidity climbed into high places.

A Secretary of Public Worship?

DEMOCRACY draws to a farcical close in this country. The Government, or such fanatics as usurp its functions, are determined to tell us what we may, and what we must not, drink. A political appointee at Washington, to choose the teachers and set the lessons for all American children, is the ugly dream of the "back to Prussia" educationists. Granted the premises, that the regulation of the citizen's personal habits, and the education of his children, are subject to the domination of the Federal Government, the next step is inevitable. It will lead to the establishment in this country of a Department of Public Worship.

Religion, next to education, is the most powerful social force at work among the people. So argue the secularists. In many localities, where the schools are but poorly developed, it is easily the chief, frequently the sole, social force. But it is a force often misused, oftener misdirected, dissipated, even employed for evil purposes. All other professions conform to standards set by the State. The lawyer's credentials must be examined by the bar, in accordance with the statute, before he can enter upon the duties of his profession. The teacher, the physician, the architect, the public accountant, all must be certified by the State, for it is the duty of the State to guard the citizen against inefficiency, malpractice, and dishonesty. Only the clergyman, whose intimate function it is, to enter into the souls of men, enlighten their consciences, direct their acts, is allowed to undertake duties of tremendous importance to the community, utterly free from the supervision of the State. But the task is too vast, too delicate, too much a matter of national concern, to be undertaken by the States. It must, therefore, devolve upon the Federal Government.

No Federal question is involved. The Secretary of Worship will not interfere with any man's religious belief, so long as, in his opinion, such belief is not inconsistent with public order and the purposes of the Administration. Through his agents and inspectors he will organize the religious belief of the community, dissolve or merge small and unimportant bodies, direct this belief in the

most effective channels, and make it a powerful arm of the State, for good order and right living.

Does the Secretary of Worship seem to belong to another age, another country? True, he does, but who would even have dreamed, a quarter of a century ago, that by 1920 a Mohammedan tenet would be part of the Constitution of the United States? Anything may happen when, to paraphrase Jefferson, the citizen ceases to be jealous of Governmental encroachment upon his rights.

Americanizing the Foreigner

JUSTICE to our people of foreign speech is the demand made by the War-Time Commission of the Protestant Churches. It is an important demand which should be heartily seconded by all Catholics. Indiscriminate repression of the use of all foreign languages is but another form of Prussianism which must lead to deplorable results. Complaints of the most unjust and un-American treatment of loyal American communities have been made and are not without foundation. Even comforting words at the graves of the dead in the only language which the mourners understood were forbidden in certain instances. Yet the children of those very men and women, so unnaturally treated, were fighting in Europe for that democracy of which their parents were robbed at home.

Savagery, in the name of patriotism, has gone so far that in one case a church, supported by citizens of foreign speech, was ruthlessly burned to the ground. The women of the congregation were with difficulty able to save their service flag, which they then hung over the smouldering ruins.

It would be hard to conceive of any better means for breeding Bolshevism in our land than such methods, were it not for the fact that our foreign-speaking citizens are in many instances far more loyal and law-abiding Americans than the Prussian patriots wrapped in our American flag. "One of the difficulties in a situation like the present," says ex-President Taft, "is that men, by their extreme and unreasonable opinions, seek to earn a reputation for patriotism which they do not deserve."

The fault lies with us if foreign-born citizens have never learned the language of our country. It is our indifference and shortsightedness, as it has often and rightly been said, which deprived them of the opportunities of learning the language with which they would gladly have become acquainted. Few among them failed to understand the great advantages that familiarity with the language of the country of their adoption would bring to them. All possibilities of advancement were forever shut off from many of them owing to this deficiency, which they keenly realize. It is not by methods of force that we are now to correct our failure, but by sympathy. We must bring with us an understanding of their own conditions and an appreciation of all that is excellent in those of foreign birth if we would Americanize them in the true sense.

Literature

THE SOLITARY OF SONG.

FATHER GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS was the solitary of song. Many fine poets have failed to win recognition in their generation; none, I think, except one poet, the subject of this article, has deliberately tried to avoid recognition. He went into a desert place apart—to sing! He was the lyrical lover of God driven into the Thebaid, and there he sang not only amid solitude and silence, but amid self-inflicted suffering. He mortified his art with loneliness and lashes. As we shall see presently, this poet who avoided publicity and the applause of men did so that he might uninterruptedly strive, with I know not what ascetic discipline, to make of verse a thing more arduous and daring than it had ever been before. Fra Angelico is said to have painted his pictures upon his knees and with frequent floods of tears; Father Hopkins wrote his poems nailed to a cross. In one of his sonnets, that of St. Alphonsus Rodriguez, he sings of that Saint's hidden life. His own, so full of what would have won him fame, was lived, just as quietly, teaching Latin to boys.

Yet God (that hews mountain and continent,
Earth, all, out; who, with trickling increment,
Veins violets and tall trees makes more and more)
Could crowd career with conquest while there went
Those years and years by of world without event
That in Majorca Alfonso watched the door.

Gerard Manley Hopkins' life could be put into a sentence: he was born; he became a Catholic; then a Jesuit; and he died. Those are the only things usually called events. It had adventures, but no incident. However, to give to his biography the details it possesses: The poet was born in July, 1844, at Stratford. In 1862 he won an exhibition at Baliol and went up to Oxford in the same year. On October 21, 1866, he was received into the Catholic Church, despite Pusey's sarcasms and Liddon's well-meant advice. The following year he left Oxford and was invited by Newman to become a master in the Oratory School. On September 8, 1868, he entered the Jesuit novitiate. In June, 1889, he died in Dublin.

When dealing with Father Hopkins' poetry it is necessary to make some preliminary remarks about its faults. They are so obvious that one has to admit them before one can attempt to prove the merits. To begin with something which is not really a fault but which will generally be considered as such, Hopkins is, upon the whole, the most densely obscure poet who ever wrote in English. Where Blake and Browning leave off, there Hopkins begins. The first two of these three poets, though hard to follow at times, are usually less difficult than is commonly supposed. Their obscurity is the exception, not the rule. But with Gerard Hopkins one has to expect difficulties. Of the sonnet, the easier part of which, the sextet, I have already quoted, he said when sending it to Mr. Robert Bridges: "The sonnet (I say it snorting) aims at being intelligible." All his poems aimed at being intelligible; but usually they did not get very near their mark. To the poet himself they were clear enough. He was writing in his own way, thinking that mode of expression best suited—as it undoubtedly was—to his subject. But the poet's readers will have to struggle with the meaning if they are to master it.

The poems were intended to be read aloud; when they are read aloud most of the faults of oddity disappear. A word split in two for the sake of the rhyme—something hitherto reserved for comic effect—scandalizes the eye when it is seen in serious poetry. The ear however is more indulgent. Accentuation marks, freely used by Hopkins, to stress and emphasize verse, irritating enough in print, are a help to the voice. The poet, as Mr. Bridges has pointed out in his interesting notes, while unaware of his obscurity, admitted his metrical eccentricities.

These, however, were systematized into a logical scheme, which he fully and clearly explained. This is a technical matter, and need not be discussed here, but the metrical method can best be likened to the use of counterpoint in music; two rhythms, one heard and one hushed, being used simultaneously. Milton used it in the choruses of "Samson Agonistes," but Hopkins developed it and extended its range. The tune consequently is confused except for a delicate ear, to which, however, the labors of so painful an art add enchantment upon enchantment. The inventor, for we may set aside Milton whose experiments were tentative, was a shy young Jesuit priest, copying poems in the privacy of a notebook during the splendid summer of Victorian verse. The sonnet on "Patience" is not given as the best example of Hopkins' peculiarity or even of his genius, though both are in it, but it may be read as a fair all-round example of his work:

Patience, hard thing! the hard thing but to pray,
But bid for, Patience is! Patience who asks,
Wants war, wants wounds; weary his time, his tasks;
To do without, take tosses, and obey.
Rare Patience roots in these, and then away,
Nowhere. Natural heart's ivy, Patience masks
Our ruins of wrecked past purpose. There she basks
Purple eyes and seas of liquid leaves all day.

We hear our hearts grate on themselves; it kills
To bruise them dearer. Yet the rebellious wills
Of us we do bid God bend to him even so.
And where is he who more and more distils
Delicious kindness? He is patient. Patience fills
His crisp combs, and that comes those ways we know.

The finest poem, to my mind, that Gerard Manley Hopkins ever wrote was when he burnt his manuscripts upon entering the Jesuit novitiate at Roehampton. Why I do not know, but I imagine that he wanted to mark his decision by abnegation. He may have felt that song, even such song as he made, was a distraction to contemplation. That he dreaded being known and admired as a poet is certain; for when he recommenced writing he would only let a very few friends read his work. Even these intimates could be counted upon the fingers of one hand. First there was Mr. Robert Bridges, the present Poet Laureate, his literary executor, who is now his editor. ("Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins," Oxford University Press). Canon Dixon, Coventry Patmore and Mr. Edmund Gosse were the only other men who were allowed to see Father Hopkins' poems. To the rest of the world he remained a Jesuit priest of no more than ordinary distinction.

The record of his friendship with Canon Dixon makes pleasant reading. Some of the most charming literary letters in the world passed between the Anglican parson and the Jesuit priest. The correspondence began when Hopkins wrote to Dixon telling him how sorry he was that his (Dixon's) poems had been so long neglected by the public, but that he had before entering his novitiate, in which he knew no books could be personally owned, copied out several of his favorite pieces. This brought back from the neglected poet a letter that was one long sob of gratitude. The friendship was continued until Father Hopkins' death with almost rapturous epistolary enthusiasm, for the men only met once and for two or three hours. So quaintly simple was the Anglican's admiration that he actually offered to advertise the Jesuit's genius in a footnote to the history of the English Church upon which he was then engaged!

With but one other man, a famous poet, was Gerard Hopkins intimate. Coventry Patmore let him revise "The Angel in the House," and had the highest opinion of his friend's critical and creative talents. But when he showed Hopkins the manuscript of a book, "the fruit of ten years' continual meditations," entitled "*Sponsa Dei*," the priest gave it back with a grave

look and the remark, "That's telling secrets." The holocaust of Roehampton was repeated, and Patmore put the manuscript in the fire.

Gerard Manley Hopkins has been dead for thirty years, and at last the hitherto sealed treasury of his lyrical art is open to us. To the general reader of poetry, to the professional poet and to the Catholic these poems, now published in a complete edition for the first time, will be forever one of the most valued of their possessions.

THEODORE MAYNARD.

For a Silly Poor Soul

"If ever thou gavest meat or drink,—
Every nighte and alle,
The fire sall never make thee shrink;
And Christe receive thy saule."

For meat and drink that you have given,
God will find you a place in Heaven.

For the kind words that you have spoken,
God will not let your soul be broken.

Bread on the waters you have cast,
And God will save your soul at last.

Wherever you go—and the world is wide—
My prayers shall be ever at your side.

For I, perverse and foolish, too,
Know the dark ways your soul went through.

You who were given the greatest grace
Cast it away with a tortured face.

But if I see the good in you,
Will God in His mercy not see too?

Will God not make you clean and whole
And Christ receive your silly poor soul?

ALINE KILMER.

REVIEWS

John McCormack: His Own Life Story. Transcribed by PIERRE V. R. KEY. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co. \$2.50.

What Mr. Edwin Schneider is to John McCormack on a concert program that Mr. Pierre V. R. Key is to the great artist of song in this quasi-autobiography. Soloist and accompanist are masters of technique in this *genre* of art; the effect is artistically and ethically a notable achievement. On the score of artistry, the book exhibits a long list of excellences; the judicious selection of important biographical incidents, a true eye for perspective, dignity in calculation, restraint in amplification, and felicity in managing color and light, the skill of *chiaroscuro*, or, as is said of Mr. McCormack on another platform, the perfection of tone and tempo. And on the ethical side, the book is an atmosphere of health, an inspiration for endeavor, the record of a career that might stand within the picturesque proportions of a dream, but is something greater in the simplicity of its reality. His religious faith, his domestic joys, his craftsmanship in song: these are the high lights in Mr. McCormack's life, and every page of this captivating story is illumined by them.

Two Bishops are forever memorable in John McCormack's career: Bishop Clancy of Summerhill College, whose encouraging words and financial assistance made possible the completing of studies in Italy; and Bishop Curley of St. Augustine, Florida, the classmate of college days, and the devoted friend through the years, and even in this biographical enterprise a capable assistant. Due tribute is given to the "coaches" of the training singer, from the simple cook in Summerhill College, who chided him for his lack of intelligible enunciation—which nobody now can impute to him—on to the Italian *maestro*, Sabatini, who led his pupil to the high plains of technique, and to whose affectionate invitation, "Hear my Giovanni," a world of enthusiastic song-lovers respond. A long line of dignitaries appears with becoming intimacy in this charming story; Pope Pius X saying on a day in the Vatican, as his hand was at a pilgrim's lips, "Oh, and so this is our tenor," and President Wilson's congratulations with a warm grasp of the hand on a historic day at Mt. Vernon: "I never heard the 'Star-Spangled Banner' sung, Mr. McCormack, as you have sung it. I thank you from the bottom of my heart."

The accompanist to this biographical *melopoeia* deserves his meed of the applause. Mr. Key shows a skilled hand, *da capo al fin*. His interludes to the words of the soloist are exquisitely done—graceful turns from a statement of fact to reflective observations; giving the right emphasis to details in the story; setting in proper time and tune the narrator and the narrative. And it is not only the interesting incidents out of a past that Mr. Key harmonizes, but, to change the metaphor, he presents a faithful picture of Mr. McCormack in the present, a scenario in which the personality of the artist, of his family circle, of the charming vistas of nature and society at Rocklea, his summer home, are all engagingly delineated.

M. E.

Counter-Attack and Other Poems. By SIEGFRIED SASSOON. With an Introduction by ROBERT NICHOLS. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$1.25.

These bitter war poems are from the pen of a British soldier who has witnessed or experienced the horrors he cynically describes, for he fought three times in France, once in Palestine and wears the Military Cross. The poems on the war that appeared in "The Old Huntsman," his 1917 book, won the unqualified favor of the fighting men in France. "That's the stuff we want," they said. "We're fed up with the old men's death-or-glory stunt." The author holds that war's "spiritual disasters far outweigh any of its advantages" and the verses in "Counter-Attack" are meant to prove that thesis. The following sonnet entitled "Dreamers" well expresses Sassoon's idea of the fighting man:

Soldiers are citizens of death's grey land,
Drawing no dividends from time's tomorrows.
In the great hour of destiny they stand,
Each with his feuds, and jealousies, and sorrows.
Soldiers are sworn to action; they must win.
Some flaming fatal climax with their lives.
Soldiers are dreamers; when the guns begin
They think of firelit homes, clean beds and wives.
I see them in foul dug-outs, gnawed by rats,
And in the ruined trenches, lashed with rain,
Dreaming of things they did with balls and bats,
And mocked by hopeless longing to regain
Bank-holidays and picture-shows and spats,
And going to the office in the train.

"The Fathers," "Remorse," "Base Details" and the incompetent "General" who "did for them both by his plan of attack" are poems which vividly express the private's point of view. "Glory of Women" and "Their Frailty" indicate what a very imperfect conception the women at home have of war's dire realities, and there is dreadful irony in "Does It Matter?" Such stanzas as "Banishment" and "Thrushes," however, contain more poetry and these lines on "The Hawthorn Tree" show the author at his best:

Not much to me is yonder lane
Where I go every day;
But when there's been a shower of rain
And hedge-birds whistle gay,
I know my lad that's out in France
With fearsome things to see,
Would give his eyes for just one glance
At our white hawthorn tree.
Not much to me is yonder lane
Where he so longs to tread;
But when there's been a shower of rain
I think I'll never weep again
Until I've heard he's dead.

The blasphemous quotation from Blake with which Robert Nichols ends his introduction to the poems, and which the publishers, with worse taste, print on the book's jacket, is not justified by the volume's contents.

W. D.

A History of Europe. By A. J. GRANT, Professor of History in Leeds University. New York: Longmans Green & Co. \$2.75.

Professor Grant covers in his book the entire history of Europe, beginning with Ancient Greece, down to the middle of the great war; and he does it excellently. His book shows a better perspective than most of its class, and is wider in its survey, as it takes in many nations generally left out of sight in historical compendiums, though conspicuous enough at present; such as the Balkan States and the oppressed nationalities of Russia. Then, too, Ireland not only gets more frequent and juster mention than is customary, but, what is quite unique, is made to furnish illuminating comparisons and side-lights to the general course of history. Mr. Grant is evidently a Liberal in politics, as he does not hesitate to paint clearly England's iniquity in her treatment of the "Sister Isle"; thus after comparing the policy of Philip II in the Netherlands to that of Elizabeth in Ireland, to the manifest disadvantage of the latter, he concludes with the statement of Lord Burleigh, Elizabeth's great counselor, that: "the Flemings had not such cause to rebel against the oppression of the Spaniards as the Irish against the tyranny of England."

Yet with all its excellencies, the book has abundance of errors, misleading statements and inaccuracies. The author seems unable to grasp the real principles at issue in the incessant conflicts of the Church and the lawless princes in the Middle Ages. Perhaps less devotion to State-supremacy and more to historical accuracy and research might lead to a readjustment of many views and statements. As a Protestant, he handles Luther and the Reformation so tenderly as to be quite one-sided; the same bias may also be responsible for his placing the development of the Papacy so late. For even if he avoided the Christian Fathers, no mean authorities in early ecclesiastical history, consultation with such Protestants as Harnack would have carried him far beyond Gregory I to the days of Victor I at least (189-198) for the full manifestation of the Papal powers and claims. Further mistakes are the failure to state correctly the true purport of the Isidorian Decretals, as well as their appearance "in Rome about the year 860," which will be news to historians; and his assertion that the "immediate object" of the Inquisition was "the forcible conversion of the Jews."

J. F. X. M.

For the Faith: Life of Just de Bretenières. Martyred in Korea, March 8, 1866. Adapted from the French of C. APPERT by FLORENCE GILMORE. Maryknoll, Ossining, N. Y.: Catholic Foreign Mission Society. \$1.00.

Some years ago Mgr. John J. Dunn brought out under the title "A Martyr of Our Own Day" a biography of the young French missionary whose story is fascinating. But that book is now out of print and meanwhile a new and more complete life of the martyr has been prepared by Father Appert, a professor at the College of St. Francis de Sales, Dijon: this work Miss Florence Gilmore has made attractive for American Catholic readers, and the Maryknoll Press has published it in a finely illustrated edition in the hope that the edifying volume will help to foster vocations for the foreign missions among our young men.

Just de Bretenières was born of rich and aristocratic parents at Chalons-sur-Saône in 1838 and from his earliest years seemed to be heeding the apostolic call that finally led him to martyrdom. When twenty-one he entered the seminary of Issy, passed subsequently to the Rue de Bac, became a priest in May, 1864, and two months later left France forever and started for Korea, the destined field of his missionary labors. It was only with great difficulty and after enduring many hardships that Father

Bretenières succeeded in entering Korea at all, for the natives of that country were then very hostile to Europeans. Soon after the missionary's arrival certain dynastic changes increased that opposition and the young priest had not been working among the Koreans for more than a few months before a violent persecution broke out against the French missions. In January, 1866, Father Bretenières was seized, bound and dragged away to prison and torture. After bravely enduring at the hands of his captors dreadful sufferings which recall Brebeuf's martyrdom in Canada, Father Bretenières was beheaded, thus laying down his life for the Faith he tried to bring to the Koreans.

W. D.

The Doctor in War. By WOODS HUTCHINSON, M.D. With Illustrations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$2.50.

This author is well-known as a writer for the public on quasi-medical topics, some of which have been reviewed in AMERICA previously. Most of the chapters of this book have already appeared in magazine or newspaper articles, and this fact probably accounts for the needless repetitions which occur throughout the book. In the capacity of a journalist, Dr. Hutchinson visited the various medical departments of the forces on the western front during 1917. Where there was so much to be observed it is quite probable that some things were overlooked, but one seeks with some surprise for a single honorable mention of the K. C. where the Y. M. C. A. are repeatedly receiving the highest praise, since the returning soldiers are so outspoken in their commendation of the former, and their condemnation of the latter organization. The statement also that "Papa Joffre" is the greatest general of the war will certainly not be accepted by countless readers who have learned to admire the brilliant strategy of Marshal Foch.

The book is interesting and instructive in many ways, but the author is apt to accept too readily first impressions on new methods, and to draw too general conclusions from facts, which were, partly at least, the result of the abnormal environment in which the men were living. His account of the recoveries is so enthusiastic as to blind our eyes to the frightful mortality of the war, which is much higher, proportionally as well as absolutely, than that of any previous war. The chapter on the subject of shell-shock seems particularly sane, as it discards most of the absurd theories which have been advocated from time to time, and adopts a defective nervous system as the efficient explanation of the manifold symptoms. The fact that nearly the most common disease in the navy is neurasthenia sounds strange at first, until one reflects that the navy's task has been one of constant and sleepless strain and watchfulness in all sorts of weathers with tremendous interests and responsibilities hanging upon its care every day and night. As a piece of description, the book is well worth reading, but as a basis for scientific judgment it cannot be given such high praise.

F. J. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

AMERICA readers who have so often enjoyed Father John C. Reville's articles and reviews are sure to like his 90-page sketch of "St. Francis Xavier, Apostle of India and Japan" (America Press, \$0.20, \$10.00 a hundred) which has just been published. In a series of vivid and artistic pen-pictures the author describes the Saint's youth in Navarre, his student days at the University of Paris, his vocation to the Society, his journey to India, the wonderful results of his missionary labors there, his conquest of the keen Japanese intellect and his lonely death on the threshold of China. The little book is remarkably interesting and is sure to fill its readers with an enthusiastic admiration for Xavier's character and to stimulate their zeal for the foreign missions. The sketch is also designed to promote the spread of the well-known "Novena of Grace" which so many of the Faithful now make every year from March 4 to March 12 with such marvelous

spiritual gains. The America Press also has out a neat booklet containing all the prayers of the Novena. (\$0.05 each, \$3.00 a hundred.)

"Wild Youth and Another" (Lippincott, \$1.50), by Gilbert Parker, consists of two distinct stories with the same frontier setting and the same rough characters. They have that interest which the author knows how to impart, but lack distinction. In one of them there is a pronouncedly unpleasant atmosphere.—Leonard Merrick's volume of short stories, "While Paris Laughed" (Dutton, \$1.75), tells a dozen diverting adventures of the impecunious poet, Tricotrin. The first tale which describes how he kept Mariquot and Delphine from committing a romantic suicide, and "The Woman in the Book" which tells how he became an actress's unappreciated biographer are among the best in the volume. Tricotrin, even when he mixes with the underworld, never forgets that he is a poet, and the author portrays his hero's character with great literary skill.—The jaded reader of war-books will like Edgar Wallace's "Tam o' the Scots" (Small, Maynard, \$1.35), a canny Caledonian airman, who brought to the duty of attacking German aviators a fine spirit of chivalry. He always knows the appropriate thing to say, and his affair with the pretty American ambulance-driver ends just as it should.

In the January issue of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, and the December *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society there is further and most gratifying evidence of the progress of the new and vigorous movement to preserve the details of our Catholic American history. The contents of the Chicago quarterly is mainly devoted to papers relating to the contribution of the Illinois Catholic Historical Society to the recent State Centennial celebration. In these the records of Pierre Gibault, of Father de la Valinière, and the pioneer Catholic women, nuns and heroes of the State are given specially interesting attention. The high standard set by the earlier numbers of the quarterly is well sustained in the current offering. Philadelphia's *Records* opens with "John Keating and His Forbearers," which, in addition to supplying the facts of a long and honored career in that city of a former officer in the armies of France, makes a unit in a curious historical mosaic formed by contributions concerning the Santo Domingo French refugees to be found in the New York and Washington Catholic historical publications. Other items of the contents of this number of the *Records* are "Fifteen Years of Canadian Church History" and the conclusion of "The Life of Bishop Conwell."

The latest book by Father Husslein, of AMERICA's staff, "The World Problem, Capital, Labor and the Church" (Kenedy, \$1.25) which was reviewed in our issue of December 7, has been very favorably noticed by the magazines. The *Ecclesiastical Review*, for instance, remarks: "The book is an all-round compend of social and economic theory and practice; not a dry-as-dust manual, but an interesting and lucidly written treatment of the subject. . . . The book which the intelligent Catholic laity should read and study" and a work which "might well serve as a text-book of social principles in our colleges." And the Rev. Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell in a signed review contributed to the February number of the *American Church Monthly*, the High Anglican magazine, considers Father Husslein's volume "The most interesting book on Christian sociology published since Rauschenbusch's 'Christianity and the Social Crisis,'" and after summarizing the merits of the work the reviewer ends with the statement: "No priest or layman who thinks socially in religion can afford to be without this book." The publishers report that up to the middle of February over 3,000 copies of the "World Problem" were sold.

In response to a demand from principals and teachers, Mr. Bernard Sheridan, the Superintendent of Schools, Lawrence, Mass., has put in permanent form under the title, "Speaking and Writing English" (Sanborn, \$0.80), his chatty pamphlets on the teaching of the vernacular in elementary schools. Most faults in writing, according to the author, are due to faulty speech. Hence the emphasis laid on oral composition. "Assignment of work by grades" is definite and quite practical. "Language games" should prove interesting to the pupil and suggestive to the instructor.—Parents and teachers will find Louisa C. Lippitt's "Personal Hygiene and Home Nursing" (World Book Co., Yonkers, \$1.28) a useful book, as it aims to teach hygiene by habit-formation. The author, who is a registered nurse, has wisely followed the idea that it is much easier to teach children to live well and thus obtain good health than to teach them how to get well. The absence of technicalities and learned discussions on the scientific aspects makes the book more readable, while the cuts are well chosen to illustrate the principles being taught. The chapter on clothing is especially timely.—"The Effect of Diet on Endurance" (Yale University Press, \$0.60), by Irving Fisher, Ph.D., is a short account of an experiment in dieting, conducted recently at Yale by nine students under the supervision of the Professor of Economics, with the result that their powers of endurance were found to be increased by the simple method of the thorough mastication of food.

A slender volume by Albert R. Hassard, B. C. L., entitled "A New Light on Lord Macaulay" (Rockingham Press, Confederation Life Building, Toronto, \$0.75) gives a sketch of the essayist's career, a just appraisal of his limitations as a historian, attributes his renown to the fact that he was the author of a remarkable "literary and rhetorical style" which has "captivated the world of letters," examines the striking points of resemblance between portions of Lord Macaulay's and Lord Stanhope's works, and concludes that "It is more reasonable to ascribe the reproductions of sentence after sentence of a similar description of entirely irrelevant matter to plagiarism than to regard it as solely and entirely a curious, yet actual coincidence." The author cannot decide, however, whether Macaulay robbed Stanhope or Stanhope Macaulay. Perhaps each pillaged the other's writings.

A nation without a great literature cannot itself be great. The realization of this truth has made Van Wyck Brown in "Letters and Leadership" (B. W. Huebsch, \$1.00) issue an appeal for a literary renaissance in America. The way is now clear, the author holds, for America to play a supreme part in the higher life of the world, and this it cannot do unless it has a literature able to assume that leadership, a literature vibrant with ideals that will captivate the younger generation. Just what this "higher life" is, or what "synthesis of ideals" will appeal, we are not told. It is this vagueness, together with the utter absence of any reference to religion as an informer of ideals, that is the chief defect of the book. The chapters analyzing the reasons why Americans have hitherto turned out books but not literature are the best in the volume.—In the intervals of a busy life as a practising architect, Claude Bragdon has published seven articles and addresses under the title of "Architecture and Democracy" (Knopf, \$2.00). Mr. Bragdon is an eclectic, and searches the world for new movements that may turn out to be the guiding ones of the new age. Thus he impartially embraces the fourth dimension, Yogaism, vegetarianism, "sacramentalism," the world-soul, mobile color. Though he has not the advantage of the unified set of principles possessed by his fellow-craftsman, Mr. Cram, in his own field, architecture, Mr. Bragdon's judgment is sober and his insight unerring; he is admirable in his criticism of the past, and less so in his suggestions for the future.

EDUCATION

Pushing the Smith Bill Through

"FOR the more better assurance," announces Bottom, "tell them that I Pyramus am not Pyramus, but Bottom the weaver; this will put them out of fear." Now, as we are informed by that same immortal, there is no more fearful water-fowl than your lion living, and therefore I submit this paragraph as a prologue, writ in eight and six, to put all out of fear. Discussing the Smith bill, I have not had in mind that lion among the modernists, the Smith-Bankhead bill, or any other Congressional plan for the relief of crippled soldiers. Like war pensions and war insurance and National Soldiers' Homes, that plan is fully within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Nor was I referring to Senator Smith's bill to appropriate an annual sum of \$12,500,000 for the Americanization of the foreigner. The educational bills criticized in AMERICA were the Smith bill (S. 4987) introduced by Senator Smith of Georgia, and the Towner bill (H. R. 15,400) sponsored in the lower House by the Hon. Horace Mann Towner of Iowa, measures which refer to the Federalization of the public schools. This explanation may serve as a more better assurance, that I am not opposing any rational scheme either for the Americanization of the foreigner, or the rehabilitation of the soldier.

NEGLIGENT STATES

MUCH of the publicity matter sent out by the Bureau of Education and other interested parties, in support of the Smith and Towner bills, is decidedly misleading, not to say, disingenuous. If we propose to adopt an educational policy which, in every essential respect, reverses the ancient attitude of the Federal Government towards the States, it is only honest to state the proposition clearly. In a matter of such importance, trickery is out of place. The change may be really necessary. It is conceivable that certain States have fallen so low that they are no longer fit guardians of their own affairs. Certainly, it is startling to read of thousands in the conscripted army whose English was so small that they could not understand the commands of their officers. Worse is it, to learn from unimpeachable sources, that in some districts of the South illiteracy is higher among the whites than among the blacks, and that in these same districts, the children of foreigners have a better grasp of the English language and of American history, than the children of the old native stock. Some States, for no good reason or for reasons argued into a semblance of goodness, have scandalously neglected their schools. Utah spends upon her schools almost twice as much, per \$100 of wealth, as South Carolina, and in comparison with the ordinary Northern State, Virginia, mother of presidents and statesmen, for all the financial interest she takes in her schools, seems bent on a high place in the scale of illiteracy. Nor may other conditions affecting the schools, more particularly the outrageous laws bearing upon women and children in certain Southern States, the home of "chivalry," be left out of consideration. If an illiterate father be allowed to work an illiterate child in a coal-mine or a cotton-factory, the prospect for good citizenship is not bright. But granting these facts, it does not follow that the proper remedy is to deprive the State of its control of its schools, and set up a Prussian bureaucracy at Washington. That is prescribing decapitation for an earache. Undoubted evils must sometimes be borne patiently to avoid greater disorder.

THE REAL QUESTION

SOME supporters of this outbreak of bureaucracy have wept as wildly over the degeneracy of the States as did the walrus and the carpenter when they sobbed like anything, but still ate the oysters. Most oddly, their tears are for "democracy." One of them thus argues in the *New York Tribune* for February 17:

A Government of the people and by the people, made up of people from every land, must necessarily be determined by the character of its composite citizenship. Therefore, the

welfare and perpetuity of our nation demand that all possible encouragement be given to the States in the development of a citizenship physically and intellectually sound, imbued with the spirit and the ideals of true Americanism. Thus only can our Republic be made safe, efficient and enduring.

This is an excellent argument in proof of the truism that an alert, educated electorate is necessary in a democratic form of government. It has as direct a bearing on the Smith and Towner bills as it has on the question now agitating the followers of baseball in Chicago: "Will it be safe to play Joe Jackson in left field next season?" As much, but no more. But it sounds well, particularly when backed by the cogent argument that the average wage of teachers in this country is less by \$243, than the average wage of scrubwomen in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. All this is interesting, but hardly conclusive. It is not even to the point. It is at the opposite pole. Nobody is anxious to keep the children in the factories; nobody wishes to raise up a generation of illiterates, and all of us, except the plutocratic few, would be glad to see the framework of economic conditions in this country so altered, that richer educational opportunities might be extended to the ninety per cent of our young people whose highest educational possibility is now reached in the eighth grade of the grammar school. The real question at issue in the Smith and Towner bills, is this: Are we willing to set up an educational bureaucracy at Washington, and put it under the direction of a political appointee?

THE PERPETUATION OF BUREAUCRACY

"GIVE the States all possible encouragement," argues our advocate. Yes, but confiscation is not encouragement. It will not, in the long run, encourage the people of a given locality to greater interest in their schools, to know that after all the schools do not belong to them, but must conform to orders formulated by a politician two thousand miles away. Words have many uses, and sometimes they disguise reality most marvelously. But the whole dictionary will not obscure the fact that these bills transfer the authority of the State over its schools to a Washington bureaucracy. It will not do to say, in the words of a New York editor, that the Secretary of Education will undoubtedly be a man of high character, who will use his great powers gently. The Secretary of Education, if he ever comes into being, will be appointed for the specific purpose of putting the provisions of the Smith bill into effect, and for no other; at least, for no other purpose within the knowledge of the general public. Furthermore, to entrust powers so tremendous to one man, and that one man a political officer, with the "understanding" that they will be used with discretion, is one way, and a most excellent way, it must be confessed, of putting an end to republican institutions. Our ideal is a government of the people and by the people, and all that, and that is the precise reason why we entrust to no single individual, however exalted his "character," the authority outlined in these bills. A certain amount of bureaucracy and one-man power seems to be necessary in war time, but as the President has told us on two or three occasions, the war came to an end with the signing of the armistice. The proper policy to be now adopted, calls for the relegation of the bureaucrats and the bureaucracies to the dust-bin.

THE BILL'S NECESSARY EFFECTS

THE writer in the *New York Tribune* may understand how we can develop a democratic generation by marching the children in goose-step day by day, to some Prussianized school, but that possibility is not clear to the common garden variety of intellect. A Government in control of the schools is certain, as our Socialist friends truly say, to assume the function of thought-controller. By the terms of the Smith bill, it explicitly assumes this function. What Senator Smith calls "cooperation with the States" or "all possible encouragement to the States" means, according to the clear wording of his bill, that the States submit their courses of study, and the methods they use in the train-

ing of teachers, to the political officer at Washington. If he approves them, his favor takes the form of a nice appropriation, conjoined with the right of the Federal Government to inspect the said schools, and order what changes he may deem, in tune with the prevailing fad, fit and proper. If he does not approve the State programs, the State in question will not get one penny, until they are revamped, remade, according to the model shown at Washington.

To call in question the intentions of those who support the Smith bill, is not necessary. By its plain terms, this measure entrusts the educational destinies of 20,000,000 American children to a political appointee and his associates at Washington. It destroys the right of the State to cooperate with the parent in founding and maintaining schools. It makes all private initiative in educational work practically impossible. This is not "Federal cooperation." It is Federal domination, made doubly odious by its operation through a political bureaucracy.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S. J.

ECONOMICS

War Risk Policies

THE German U-boats have taken enormous toll in American lives, and have inflicted extensive loss and damage to property of American citizens. It is expected that reparation will be exacted for lives taken as well as for property destroyed. To quote the words of Judge Mayer in the case of the *Lusitania* reported in 251 *Federal Reporter* 715, under date of August 23, 1918:

... It is not to be doubted that the United States and her Allies will well remember the rights of those affected by the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and when the time shall come, will see to it that reparation shall be made for one of the most indefensible acts of modern times.

Property losses resultant upon U-boat activities have been estimated in millions of dollars. In the main such losses may be classified as that of "hull" or "cargo." Throughout the war the American owner of vessels or of merchandise, which while waterborne is known as cargo, sought particular protection for hull or cargo against loss by submarine attack or by other agencies of destruction utilized at sea by instruments of the Imperial Government of Germany.

METHOD OF OPERATION

THIS protection assumed the form of insurance under what was known as "war-risk policies." In event of loss of vessel or cargo from a war peril or agency the insured was indemnified by the underwriter in accordance with the terms of the war-risk policy. The rate or premium has varied in ratio to the type of vessel operating, the course of the voyage in question and the recorded activities of U-boats in areas through which the vessel was to pass to its destination.

When the property of the assured, vessel or cargo, was destroyed by agencies known as war instruments, the underwriter paid the loss to the assured, receiving from the latter an assignment of all right, title and interest in the property so insured. The substance of the assignment was sometime issued under the form of a loan "receipt." By means of this assignment the underwriter is enabled to succeed to the rights of the assured against third persons. In other words, the underwriter becomes by process of subrogation entitled to prosecute the claim of the assured against the parties or governments destroying the assured's property. Under such arrangement the underwriter of property insured against submarine loss, in event of such loss, looms up as the claimant for damages against the German Government.

Losses paid by underwriters on American hulls and cargo destroyed by U-boats have been, as stated, enormous. It appears probable that this Government will exact indemnities from the German Government for such losses. In hundreds of cases,

upon payments to assured, underwriters will become claimants for such losses. It is interesting in this connection to inquire to what extent will recognition be accorded underwriters as such claimants.

JUDGING THE CLAIMS

RECENTLY the Department of State has requested various underwriters throughout the country to submit estimates of losses paid by underwriters on hulls and cargoes destroyed at sea. Such estimates were requested to aid the Department in arriving at a tentative aggregate of such losses; a beginning, one might say, and yet a step forward toward the ultimate complete and definite analysis of such losses, upon a basis of relative accuracy.

Pending the final outcome of the Allied Peace Conference, no plan or procedure can be expected in the presentation and prospects of final settlement of such matters. It is not unlikely that a quasi-judicial commission will be created with full and complete powers to handle and pass upon such claims. The status of this tribunal will doubtlessly be international. The United States Government will no doubt assist in the protection of its citizens by representation upon such commission. In addition it is likely that a purely American commission will be created by Federal statute to pass upon the claims of American citizens as a preliminary to presentation to the international tribunal.

The right of underwriters upon payment of losses to appear as claimants for foreign indemnities is by no means a novel problem for the authorities. The question of nationality of the underwriter has made the problem difficult, and from the cases in point there has appeared in the past diversity of ruling. Then, too, must arise the question of the nationality of the assured where the property destroyed has been owned by a foreign merchant and insured by an American underwriter.

DISPUTED RULINGS

IN general, it has been admitted that insurance is a contract of indemnity, and in event of payment of loss by underwriter, the theory of subrogation prevails, the underwriter thereby succeeding to the right of the assured for the purpose of recoupment. This view, however, has not met with consistent favor and support by various international tribunals in past years. One might ask if an American underwriter of Norwegian-owned property, destroyed by a U-boat, and upon payment of loss by such underwriter, is entitled to the protection of the United States Government in the prosecution of a claim on behalf of such underwriters against the German Government. Upon principle it would seem that, while the original loss has been sustained by the Norwegian owner of merchandise, the underwriter by payment of such loss becomes the one to suffer as the result of the destruction of the property. It would seem, therefore, that the underwriter should be vested with the right of redress, since there remains no loss to the assured by virtue of the payment to him by the underwriter. Decisions of tribunals in the past have not been always in accord with this theory, although there have been in the past instances where the nationality of the underwriter alone governed the situation independent of the nationality of the assured ("Moore's Arbitrations," secs. 4516, 3911, 3920).

The right of the foreign underwriter of American property to share in the indemnities against a foreign government has been made largely a matter of treaty regulation. What provisions will be made in the treaty now in preparation in this regard can only be conjectured. In the larger number of reported cases the insurers or underwriters have been given an independent status before international tribunals.

It is interesting to note that section 12 of the Act of June 23, 1874, establishing the first court of Alabama Claims, limited the right of recovery for underwriters to so much of its losses

in respect of war risks "as exceeded the sum of.....his premium or other gains upon or in respect to such war risks."

In addition to other possible sources providing the enormous funds to be required of the German Government against which to levy all claims for destruction by such activity on the seas, it is hoped that the many millions of funds belonging to German authorities will be applied to payment of losses incurred by Americans as a result of the ravages of the U-boats directed by the once Imperial Government of Germany.

LESTER B. DONAHUE, Ph.D.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The Honor Roll of French Jesuits

"WILL the splendid patriotism of these exile priests who returned freely to serve and die for the country whose Government has outlawed them, have any weight towards winning the rights of citizenship again when peace is declared?" is the question asked by F. Woodlock, S. J., C. F., in the *London Tablet*, to which he communicates the following interesting statistics:

French Jesuits engaged in the war up to armistice day: 841 were mobilized. Of these, 98 were officers, 2 commanders, one lieutenant-commander, 11 captains, 4 naval lieutenants, 24 lieutenants, 50 second lieutenants, 1 naval ensign, 5 officers in the service of the sick and wounded; 39 received the Legion of Honor, 26 received the Military Medal, 303 received the Croix de Guerre, 4 received the Médaille des Epidémies, 3 received the Medal of Morocco or Tunis, 3 gained English decorations, 11 gained other foreign decorations, 519 were mentioned in the Order of the Day, 154 were killed. These include 23 chaplains, 29 officers, 36 sous-officers, 16 corporals, 50 privates.

If the statistics of other Religious Orders and of the French secular clergy were available, Father Woodlock is convinced that they would reveal the same heroic spirit.

"Great Is Smith of Georgia"

"GREAT is Smith of Georgia!" exclaims the *Catholic Advance*, of Wichita, Kans., and adds by way of explanatory parenthesis that he is not related to the first John of Virginia. The manner in which American children may hereafter be standardized, if the Georgia Senator is to have his way, is thus hinted by the editor:

A system of education is to be provided with teachers and courses of study selected by a bureaucracy in Washington. Naturally the system would vary from administration to administration. There might be vegetarianism and plural marriage under one regime and hydropathy and Spiritism under another. Anything so unimportant as the wishes and beliefs of the parents could not be considered for a moment. Parents would, of course, have their uses as providers of food and raiment, according to the regulations of the national board. The idea of State-trained children is not original with the gentleman from Georgia. It was made in Prussia.

The writer adds that there should be an amendment to the bill limiting the number of offspring to be born. This, too, is seriously recommended by other reformers and is included in the British Laborite plan of Motherhood Endowment. We, too, may hear of it before very long.

Catholic Colonization Society

NOTHING could be more timely than to call attention at the present moment to the excellent work accomplished by the Catholic Colonization Society of the United States in its co-operation with the Government. It is the particular desire of the Administration to place on desirable farms all such soldiers as may by experience and inclination be adapted to agricultural

work. Besides rendering all possible assistance to the Government in this undertaking, the Society has submitted several important projects which are now under investigation. The object of the Catholic Colonization Society and its accompanying Land Information Bureau is to direct to suitable farm homes all those, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, whom it deems adapted to the agricultural life. It has investigated and officially recommended some thirty projects in fifteen different States and stands ready to offer free information and direction to all in quest of a farm home. In thanking the Society for a copy of its "Reports and Recommendations on Farm Land Projects" Cardinal Gibbons writes of it:

In looking through its pages I am delighted with the broad scope of its activities, and the thoroughness of its investigations; but most pleasing is the practical charity dispensed in placing gratis the advantages of the society at the disposal of those seeking a betterment of their material and spiritual welfare by turning to the tilling of the soil.

The Society, under the direction of Archbishop Messmer, has received the most cordial recommendations of Mr. Herbert Hoover, Secretary Lane and others. Its headquarters are at Ashland Block, Chicago.

Our Appalling Losses in Battle

ACCORDING to a special correspondent of the *New York Evening Sun*, it has been officially ascertained that the American battle losses in the European war were proportionately greater than in any of the wars in which the country engaged in the past:

The major battle casualties, that is those killed, dead from wounds or missing, are fixed by the War Department statisticians at fifty-seven per 1,000 annually, twenty-four per 1,000 greater than the North suffered in the Civil War; forty-two per 1,000 greater than the United States troops suffered in the Mexican War, 1846 to 1848, and more than fifty-two per 1,000 greater than in the brush with Spain in 1898.

Some official figures place our losses even higher and estimate them at more than, seventy per 1,000. Such calculations, presumably, are based exclusively upon the last twelve or thirteen months of the war in which practically all our casualties were sustained, although troop shipments began in July. While British casualties were much higher, our losses are rendered appalling by the fact that our troops were in but few engagements. A more pleasing deduction is found in the disease rate, which was seventeen per 1,000 for the men overseas and sixteen for the men in camps at home. Had it not been for the influenza epidemic it would have been much lower. It is the first time that the American death-rate from disease was not higher than that sustained in battle. About eighty-five per cent of the men wounded in action were able later to return to the front.

Georgetown University School of Foreign Service

A SCHOOL of Foreign Service was opened at Georgetown University February 17 with a roster of seventy students. It is understood that the present schedule is provisional only, since the formal opening of the school will not take place until October, 1919. The languages taught are English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Japanese and Russian. The economic and commercial group of courses embraces, besides the principles of political economy, lectures on staple commodities of world trade, on Latin-American trade problems and on accounting. The law and political science section consists of courses in international law and the interpretation of recent legislations affecting foreign and domestic commerce, special attention being given to the Webb-Pomerene law of April 10, 1919. In the shipping section are taught: ocean transportation, ports and terminal facilities, steamship accounting, marine geography, marine insurance and

admiralty law. The latter section is at present reserved for experienced students chosen by the United States Shipping Board. The exceptional commercial personnel now gathered at the National Capital has made possible the selection of an unusually qualified corps of instructors, practical linguists, jurists, trade experts and other specialists. The new courses are opened conformably with the resolutions adopted by the Reconstruction Congress held at Atlantic City at the call of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Education in foreign commerce was thus insisted upon by the Congress:

In the larger opportunities which are to be opened to American business men to play a part in the international commerce of the world the need will be felt for more men who are trained to a knowledge and understanding of the language, the business methods and the habits of thought of foreign lands. Complete success can only come to those who succeed in putting themselves into full accord and sympathy with the peoples with whom they are to deal.

We urge upon our industrials that they take steps to provide opportunities to young men to obtain an education in the practices of overseas commerce and finance and in the practical use of foreign languages.

We call the attention of the various departments of government and of educators to the importance of this matter and ask that special efforts be made to supplement the valuable work already done and to open up every facility to the furtherance of a successful prosecution of this educational work.

The State Department, too, has expressed its desire to increase its services, diplomatic, consular and commercial. Its recommendations point to the enormous international responsibilities before the United States in finance and commerce as well as in international politics. The location at Washington of so many national bureaus, boards and commissions will give to Georgetown University unrivaled facilities, and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has already expressed its desire to be of assistance in the development of the new school established to prepare students for foreign trade and Government service.

"The Wings of Tomorrow"

"A SILVER thread that was the Mississippi, a black line that was the Eads Bridge," says Willard Hart Smith in the *Forum* describing his flight in an airplane over St. Louis. "Toy houses, toy trees, toy people, as if spilled out of a child's Noah's Ark. From the passenger plane the city was a nursery floor." But it is the commercial rather than the poetic aspect that interests him. He wonders if American business men have fallen asleep while Great Britain, France, Scandinavia and what is left of Germany are wide-awake and working restlessly. "Do you know," he asks them, "that the other day an aeroplane carried a piano from London to Paris?" He then continues to ply the reader with questions such as these:

Do you know that with the signing of the armistice the British Government's Civil Aerial Transportation committee investigated the commercial possibilities of the air? And that it has already made its report and made it favorably? Do you know that in Malmo, Sweden, an air-transport company has been formed and will soon operate with Germany, Denmark and Finland? Do you know that there is already in existence an air-passenger service between London and Paris, operating on a regular schedule, at seventy-five dollars a trip, which takes only two and a half hours to make, and in two months has carried 1,200 passengers across the channel? Do you know that in Italy there is an airway between the industrial centers of Turin and Milan, between Milan and Rome, and that for every twelve miles of these routes there is a landing field? Do you know that in London there has been incorporated the Anglo-American Aerial Service, Ltd., "to establish lines of aerial conveyance between Britain, America, Canada, Central and South America"?

These are some of the questions he flings in rapid machine-

gun fire at our American business men. He recalls that four army fliers recently completed the journey from California to New York in *thirty-three hours and forty-seven minutes*, actual flying time. By air route New York is but two days from London and three and one-half days from Bagdad. Mr. Willys is quoted as saying that the development of practical safety devices will bring the number of casualties from flying to a lower percentage than those from the use of automobiles, while the expense in the construction of flying boats, capable of carrying fifty people, will be no greater than the building of first-class railroad passenger cars, after the experimental and development stages are passed. Charles H. Day, Chief Engineer of the Standard Aircraft Corporation, believes that the "sky flivver" will be no more expensive to operate than its earthly counterpart. The Post Office Department, the writer tells us, has already mapped out air-routes to cover the entire country and printed them in map form for actual use, while the army air service is doing the work the cavalry used to do in locating the best roads, fords and bridges.

The Protestant Union of Church and State

TIME was when the idea of a union of Church and State was anathema to American Protestants. All this has changed. Nothing is now more ardently advocated and more earnestly promoted by certain Protestant preachers and organizations than such a union. But it is a union of the United States with Protestantism. It is not the union of mutual helpfulness such as the Catholic Church understands, in which the latter is pledged to refrain from all politics as such, while politicians in turn are to refrain from intermeddling with the Church. It is primarily a political union that is in practice being established. Some interesting quotations relative to this project are collected by a non-Catholic writer, John N. Quinn, of Washington, D. C. Thus the *Christian Union* frankly stated, as early as September 8, 1887: "The political aim of Christianity is to bring forth a time in which Christianity shall control the caucus, religion shall control politics, the politicians shall be saints, and the polls shall be holy ground." This was in great part accomplished, to the great joy of Methodism and the allied sects, when the Prohibition Amendment was introduced as the result of such political intrigues. In the *Signs of the Times*, November 27, 1907, a Baptist minister of Los Angeles, Cal., the Rev. W. F. Ireland, is quoted as saying:

I am going back to Washington to confer with Rev. W. F. Crafts. We purpose to organize a Sunday Rest League, and to erect a guillotine in the United States in view of which every politician will recognize the fact that he is destined to political beheadal if he does not give to us the legislation we demand for the protection of the moral welfare of the people.

That guillotine, too, was erected in due time. In view of it the Prohibition Amendment was added to our Constitution. It is left to these random preachers to decide what is moral or immoral. The moderate use of alcoholic beverages is considered immoral in the Koran alone and abstinence from it for centuries has produced that splendid type, "the unspeakable Turk," whose virtues we are now to emulate. Sunday baseball and the immorality of cigarette-smoking have not been forbidden in even the Book of Mohammed. We may presume that these and similar evils were in the mind of the Rev. M. A. Gault, of the National Reform Association, when he wrote in the *Christian Statesman*, January 13, 1887: "Our remedy for all these malefic influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it," that is, which does not conform with the hysterical projects of these preacher-politicians.